

329.6
An 85

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANTI-THIRD TERM REPUBLICAN CONVENTION.

MASONIC HALL,

St. Louis, Mo., May 6th, 1880.

At about 12:30 o'clock, Gen. John B. Henderson, Chairman of the Anti-Third Term Executive Committee, called the convention to order and nominated E. C. Hubbard, of Kentucky, to act as temporary chairman. Carried.

The Hon. E. C. Hubbard addressed the Convention as follows :

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: For the distinguished honor of being called upon to preside over this Convention, allow me to express to you my heartfelt thanks. We have assembled here to-day as Republicans. If we loved the Republican party less there would be no motive why this concourse of people should have gathered together. We come here, then, as Republicans who have believed, and who do believe, that the best agency for preserving the magnificent results of the war is the Republican party. [Applause.] The Republican party will be called upon to nominate its candidate for President. I only say what every man believes when I declare that it is possible for the Republican party to nominate the next President of the United States. [Applause.] Now, at a moment when it would seem morally impossible that we can be mistaken in the line of our duty, and when the path to success is so straightforward and so plain, we are confronted with a great and impending danger in the violation of a long line of experience, in the violation of a tradition that is more sacred than law itself. Against common reason, common sense, and respectable prudence, a party has arisen in the land within our ranks who believe, or affect to believe, that the best interests of that party lie in committing it to the third-term issue. To prevent in so far as we are able the Republican party from committing itself to this issue, and, if possible, to avert the impending danger, is the mission of this mass Convention. While not so numerous as brave, I undertake to say that this meeting represents more people than were ever represented by a single Convention in the history of a nation. [Applause.] In the brief time allotted me I can do no more than summarize the objections to the third term.

First—It violates a conservative tradition which I regard as essential to the permanency to republican institutions. [Applause.]

Second—A third term transmits with added and offensive danger that which in our institutions is more perilous. I allude to the spoils of office. [Applause.]

Third—The third term is a step in the direction of constitutional monarchy that no Republic can afford to take. [Great applause.]

Fourth—The third term will commit the Republican party to a false issue, and upon that issue we are going to fail. [Applause.]

The objections, in brief, and a thousand others, illustrated by arguments patent, powerful and conclusive, furnish a sufficient reason for the thinking observer to warn the Republicans against the impending danger. [Applause.] We do not meet to advance the interests of any particular candidate. [Great applause.] We are not here to express our private views or redress private grievances, if any there be. [Applause.] We have no axes to grind. [Applause.] We do not intend to turn the stone for anybody. This convention, in my judgment, indorses the best sentiment of the Republican party and of all parties. [Applause.] We voice the sentiment of the people, who, to have the opportunity to express themselves uncontrolled by the machine, would, with a single voice, as a single man, declare that no man ought to be elected President for a third time. [Applause.] I have no time to further digress upon this question.

We protest against the third-term policy for another reason. The man who is the embodiment of it—who is at this hour campaigning for votes—of all men in the United States is the least fitted by nature or education to hold it. [Applause.] Two years of a second term demonstrated, to my mind at least, conclusively the utter inability of that man to surround himself by men who could administer the affairs of this Government without stealing. [Great applause.] There was a time in our history when every Republican heart pulsated with pride at our victories and our achievements; there was an hour in our history when our battle-flags were upon the ramparts of the enemy, when our guidons were advanced clear into his camp, and when our hearts pulsated with pride and glory to uphold the flag of our country and the oriflam trembled in the breeze of Republican victory. Two years, alas! and what a change! The sun that set on the last day of that term shed its golden rays upon a wrecked, ruined, dishonored Republican party, leaving us the single legacy which is expressed, perhaps, by this: “There is ne'er an honest man in all Denmark but he is an arrant knave.” [Applause.] It left us, as a legacy, the debatable question whether a man could be a Republican without being a thief. [Applause.] This was the condition of the once bright and glorious Republican party. So far as I am concerned—and I only express my individual views—when Sumner was cut down my faith wavered; and when, for doing his duty, John B. Henderson was struck down, I ceased to be a hero-worshiper. [Great applause.] The details of this great conspiracy, which is seeking to commit us to a third term, are known to you all. Its impudence, its audacity, are exceeded only by the infamy of an attempt to thwart the will of the people, it seems to me. Now I am as proud to-day as if the results of this conspiracy were about to return to plague the inventors. Tricks and stratagems come home to roost. The Conkling and Cameron chicken is about retiring to its coop. [Laughter and applause.] One thing is demonstrated to be true, that the voice that is born of the ex-Gaugers and Storekeepers is not the voice of the people. [Applause.] This convention, by a bold and determined part, will go far toward strengthening wavering delegates, in developing the opposition to the third-term movement; and, whatever may be the outcome of our deliberations, the student of history finds no movement that parallels the courage or the manly undertaking of your declaration here to-day. [Applause.] Speaking for myself, I am a Stalwart Republican, having no faith in political transcendentalism or Brook Farm experiments. I believe that under a Republican administration the business of the Government should be administered by Republicans. I am here with no ax to grind. I am here seeking no preferment, but solely and only because I believe that the day the Republican party commits itself to the third term, that day it signs its own death-warrant. [Tremendous applause.] I trust that our action here may be the means of placing before the country some distinguished statesman whose character and Republicanism are above suspicion or reproach [applause], and that it will be the means of seeing in November a united and harmonious Republican party marching to victory. [Applause.]

“Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just.”

Somebody has said, humorously, that "four-times armed is the man that gets in the first blow." We are "thrice-armed" here because we are bold, and we are "four-times armed," because I do hope and pray that the results of our deliberations may be to give this third-term idea such a blow that there will be no track, trace or remains of it hereafter. [Applause.] I trust and hope, representing as we do so many millions of voters in this land, that our action may be so far harmonious that when we are done it can be said of us that we have won golden opinions from all sorts of people. [Great applause.]

On motion of Mr. G. L. Wright, of Missouri, Col. Eugene A. Guibert, of Iowa, was elected temporary Secretary.

Hon. G. C. Wharton, of Kentucky, moved that a Committee on Permanent Organization be appointed. Carried.

The chair appointed the following named gentlemen to act:

G. C. Wharton, Kentucky; G. A. Finkelnburg, Missouri; G. W. Allerton, New York; W. B. Clark, Massachusetts; Carl Roehl, Illinois; S. A. Archer, Indiana; E. W. Fox and M. Hunt, Missouri; W. H. Jones, Ohio; Rev. D. G. Bryant, South Carolina, and M. E. Bryant, Alabama.

F. W. Holls, of New York, moved that Major Bluford Wilson be called upon to address the convention during the time the Committee on Organization were absent. Carried.

Major Wilson's Address.

Gentlemen: It is not part of my purpose at this stage of the proceedings to rise for the purpose of making a formal speech. The Convention was not called so much for the purpose of listening to set speeches as it was for the purpose of shaping resolutions carefully and deliberately throughout, and voicing forth not only the sentiment of those present, but of the vast majority of the voters of the United States in opposition to the heresy of a third term. No man is good enough to be a third-term President of this republic in face of the unselfish and patriotic example of the father and founder of it. [Prolonged applause.] His most illustrious and immediate successors left the sanction of their immortal names to his example in declining to be third-term Presidents, and I believe that the people, "through 100 years of loyal and painful observation," have perpetuated the example into a custom that has grown to the sanctity of a part of the fundamental law of the land. We are present to-day, as citizens of the Republic, to lift our voices in solemn protest against the violation of a precedent and a custom that has become a part of the common law of the land. We are present, above all, as representatives to protest against this heresy, this blind violation of the traditions of the party and the country. [Applause.] New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin and other States have lifted up their voices in solemn protest against this departure with which the party is threatened to-day by a sensational cabal and conspiracy. [Great applause.] We are present to-day to warn these managers in earnest and deliberate language that they should not be permitted to submit the party to what the chairman has called "the signing of its death-warrant." [Applause.] Having had some experience in connection with past Republican administrations, I am unalterably opposed, above all, to the nomination of U. S. Grant. [Applause.] I cheerfully recognize his claims upon the country for his patriotic services as a leader in crushing out the rebellion, yet, in the presence of an issue like this, personal consideration should not influence the judgment of thinking people to lead them into by and forbidden paths, and commit them to a departure which threatens the existence of the party, and which in future bears a menace of danger to the Republic itself. So far as the delegates are personally concerned we may be insignificant; we are not chosen by the ringleaders of the party to voice the sentiment of ring organization. The sentiment we reflect is of the vast majority of the voters of the United States in opposition to a third term. Looking at the party to-day, where is the strength of the third-term movement? Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Massachusetts, and all of glorious New England are either silent upon the subject or engaged in a deadly contest for the purpose of throttling the heresy in its inception. The sentiment is strong in South Carolina, a State which illustrated during the administration of Senator Patterson "some of the beauties of what we must expect under a third term." According to Grant himself, the State stands to-day erect, reconstructed, while under Patterson's administration, according to Patterson's own words, it was given over to thieves and scoundrels, who preyed upon the very vitals of the people. Patterson himself, with a cunning leer upon his countenance, declared in Washington during the last days of Grant's administration, when it began to be apparent that there was to be a change in the policy of the party, that there "were five years of good stealing left in South Carolina under a Republican admin-

istration." [Applause.] Alabama, under the control and influence of George H. Spencer, was plundered until the people rose in revolution.

According to the admission of Grant himself, the condition of the people of Alabama, South Carolina, Mississippi, and every Southern State is infinitely better under the policy inaugurated by Hayes than under his own. [Applause.] These are the States to-day in which there is not the slightest hope of securing an electoral vote in favor of a Republican President, and yet they are the very States which are seeking to force upon the party a nomination which, while it might promise to lead the Spencers, the Patersons, the Wests, and the Caseys back to the flesh-pots of Egypt, yet bears with it overwhelming menace of defeat and disaster. Col. Wilson handled the "strong-government" plea severely. "True," said he, "Grant's government was a 'strong one.'" The price of disinfectants in St. Louis, I have no doubt, increased over 100 per cent. during the time he was developing some of the "strength" of his Administration. [Great laughter.] "A strong government" as illustrated by the Department of Justice under George H. Williams, who stood by and saw, unmoved, an infamous conspiracy against the liberty of a distinguished citizen of the District of Columbia concocted simply for the reason that Columbus Alexander had the courage and the manhood to protest against outrage and wrong and thieving in the affairs of the Administration of the District. [Applause.] "A strong Government" as illustrated further by the fact that under the administration of the same Williams the United States Marshals in nearly every Southern State squandered hundreds of thousands of dollars in the business of setting up primaries and controlling State Conventions in the interest of the Republican party. [Applause.] A "strong Government" as illustrated by the administration of the affairs of the Interior Department under the "great and good" Delano [laughter], who to his son John was in the habit of repeating, doubtless, that old couplet: "Lord, bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four, and no more." "A strong government" as illustrated by the administration of the War Department under a name which the speaker was ashamed to mention in a Republican Convention such as this—under an administration when the Germans of this country, under their great and eloquent exponent, Carl Schurz, were obliged to move in the Senate of the United States for an investigation of a corrupt sale of arms to Frenchmen in violation of National law. [Tremendous applause.] In reference to this matter, Col. Wilson, without desiring to be personal, said he had seen a letter from one Cabinet officer to the wife of another charging that "if that Senatorial investigation went any farther it would involve the wife of a Cabinet Minister connected with that speculation." (Applause.) "A strong Government" as further illustrated in the administration of that same department when every American blushed for very shame at the name of Belknap, from whom Grant declared that he "parted, regretting." He had not one word of regret, however, in parting from such distinguished men as Jacob T. Cox, of Ohio, or Ben Bristow, of Kentucky. (Applause.) He had no regrets when the courageous and intrepid Ebenezer R. Hoar went out of the Department of Justice because he was not permitted to administer his Department in accordance with what he believed to be the simple rules of justice and right. (Applause.)

He had no regrets when such an intrepid reformer and gallant executive as Marshall Jewell was asked to step down and out of the office of Postmaster-General simply because he had the manhood and the courage of his convictions to stand by Bristow and others who were endeavoring to do their duty by the country, under the laws of the country, which they regarded as paramount to their obligation to Gen. Grant or anybody else. (Great applause.) "A strong government" as illustrated by the administration of the Navy Department in such pieces of villainy as the Secor contracts, for which Robeson escaped impeachment simply because he had the nerve, courage and audacity to stand up and brazen out his infamy, and in regard to which Gen. Grant never raised his voice in protest or objection. (Applause.) If this is the character of the "strong" government now desired, if these are the data from which to judge of the future—and since the days of Patrick Henry there is no other way to judge but by the past—then let the people meet and say, as with one voice, as he believed they would, "We will not have or support a man who thus illustrates strong government in violation not only of what seem to be the traditions of the party, but the precedent and customs of the country concentrated by a hundred years of acquiescence by the men of all parties." (Prolonged applause.)

"Vote for Tilden," shouted an outsider.

"No," replied Major Wilson, "not for Tilden, either. (Applause.) We are, first and above all, Republicans. (Applause.)

We stand here to-day by the faith handed down by the fathers, emphasized and repeated by the Republican party in all the great Republican States of the nation. Let others go, we remain. (Applause.) We will stand fast and true. The example of that illustrious and immortal name (Washington) has given us a patrimony of which we should all be proud. Be not led off into supporting any other men whose record is open to such just criticism as that of Samuel J. Tilden. (Applause.) If we can do no better, we can at least do what some of our colored friends are fond of doing down South—"take to de woods" (laughter and applause), or, as the alternative to that, we can, in the bright certainty that we are right and that our friends are wrong, present to the country, at some convention which shall hereafter be called, some man who is at once a representative of the anti-third-term theory and of an honest, faithful administration of public affairs in the interests of the people. (Applause.) Some such name I am proud I can mention; some such name as that of your own genial John B. Henderson (applause), always in the forefront of the battle for right, brave, intrepid, regardless either of consequences personal to himself or of the frowns of executive disfavors. (Loud applause.) He had the courage and the manhood, with the power of his convictions of duty, to back up a Grand Jury and prosecute a man who was the favorite then in the White House, and he would, I have no doubt, with equal courage and equal wisdom, have prosecuted even the Executive himself had he been unworthy. (Tremendous applause.) There are other noble names such as Cox, of Ohio, Hawley, of Connecticut, George William Curtis, of New York, under whose leadership the party would be proud to rally and fight for liberty and the right of being citizens of "the grandest and freest Republic under the sun." This movement and those engaged in it will doubtless be sneered at by some organs. I could mention one in St. Louis, and another in Chicago, the latter of which, during the whole time when the Government was trying to bring to justice men who had been fattening upon the spoils of the people, had not a word of encouragement or cheer for those who with their best abilities were prosecuting such thieves. (Applause.) But the anti-third-term men, strong in their convictions that they are right, and backed by such eloquent and burning words as those of Mr. Bellows, Woolsey, Schurz, Cox, and others, can afford to go forward to whatever fate fortune might have in store for them, but always and under all circumstances determined to stand by and uphold the Republican doctrines given to them by the fathers, and the laws and time-honored customs of the country. (Prolonged applause.)

At the conclusion of Col. Wilson's telling and eloquent address, Chairman Wharton of the Committee on Organization made the following report:

For President, Hon. John B. Henderson, of Missouri.

Vice Presidents, F. W. Holls, of New York, Franklin McTeigh, of Illinois, Otto Kirchner, of Michigan, John W. Carter, of Massachusetts, E. R. Wood, of Pennsylvania, H. M. Turner of Georgia, G. W. Bryant, of South Carolina, M. E. Bryant, of Alabama, L. M. Eembitz, of Kentucky, Robert A. Hill, of Indiana, J. H. Wells of Florida, Judge R. E. Rombauer, of Missouri and Dr. H. J. Lampe, of Missouri, Rufus Anderson, of Kansas, E. A. Fulton, of Arkansas, Carl Grandpre, of Nebraska, T. D. Smalls, of Texas, Major Geo. B. Halsted, of Minnesota, A. Hartzer, of Wisconsin and W. W. Wheeler, of California.

Secretaries: Col. Eugene A. Guilbert, of Iowa, Maj. E. S. Foster, of Missouri, Col. F. T. Ledergerber and J. Wilson, of Missouri.

The report of the committee was received and adopted.

E. B. Cahoon, of Missouri, moved that a committee of three be appointed to escort the Chairman to the rostrum. Carried.

The temporary chairman appointed the following gentlemen as the committee:

Tatcher Muench, of Missouri; L. M. Dembitz, of Kentucky and W. W. Williams, of Minnesota.

General Henderson's Address.

GENTLEMEN—My first duty is to thank you, as I do sincerely, for the expression of your confidence and regard. In return permit me to promise you at least an impartial discharge of the duties imposed.

And now to the business for which we have assembled.

We meet to consider and discuss political duties at an important period of our history. Theoretically, at the least, we are freemen—citizens of a republic in which each "is the

equal of his fellow." * * Every man is a part of the republic. Whatever of talent, whatever of wisdom and experience any one of us can give to the counsels of his country, it is not only his right but his duty to give. On this principle rests the theory of republican government. The freedom of speech and of the press is guaranteed no less for the benefit of the government than for the liberty and security of the citizen.

As republican government is but the rational expression of the people's will, freedom of expression, in all its forms, must be preserved, in order that this will may be ascertained. And to secure government by the people in its purity it is not enough that the freedom of speech be merely guaranteed; it is equally important that the right be exercised. If we have convictions touching our political duties those convictions should be contributed to the general expression of the popular will. And when we shall have expressed them the whole duty of patriotism is not yet discharged. These convictions must put on the garb of action. If we stop short of this our duty is but half performed.

He that is intimidated by power proves himself no less insensible than unworthy of the rights of freemen.

He that is corrupted by the temptations and promises of office sells the public weal for personal gain, and in a court of conscience accepts the taint of bribery.

He that surrenders to party what belongs to his country has already bartered his birth-right of citizenship and ceases to be a factor in the preservation of liberty.

With a proper sense, I hope and believe, of our duties and responsibilities as citizens, we meet to consider questions connected with the coming presidential election.

Some of the leaders of the Republican party tell us once more that all the hopes of American liberty now depend on their success. If this be true would it not be wise in them to adopt such policies and to nominate such candidates as may be acceptable to the largest number of its members?

We who are here, for many years have been faithful adherents of the party. We deserve some consideration in its counsels. What we ask is not unreasonable.

The candidate presented by these leaders has been president for eight years. He has already filled the two terms assigned by the constitutional fathers. Aside from the merits or demerits of his administrations, we insist that this precedent of our institutions should be observed. It is at least safe to follow it. It may be dangerous to abandon it. It is no answer to say, "This is not the law; that it is a mere custom, whose breach is better than its observance." These precedents are often wiser than the written law. The common law itself is an unwritten code, a collection of precedents and usages, which the experience of our Anglo-Saxon fathers found applicable to good government and to the security of person and property. In the language of Judge Kent, these usages and customs "do not rest for their authority upon any express and positive declaration of the will of the legislature." Again he says: "The rules and maxims which constitute the immense code of the common law grew into use by gradual adoption, and received from time to time the sanction of the courts of justice, without any legislative act or interference. It was the application of the dictates of natural justice and of cultivated reason to particular cases."

Sir Matthew Hale said that it was "the product of the wisdom, counsel, experience and observation of many ages of wise and observing men." The same may be said of the civil law, which made Rome the mistress of the world, and yet administers justice in half of Europe and a part of the United States. It is a code of precedents, deduced from universal custom, sanctioned by the wisdom of the people, and accepted and applied in the conduct of their affairs. The same is true of the public law. It is a bundle of precedents, a code of customs, and yet it is honored and obeyed by the nations of the civilized world. To destroy it is to remove gravitation from the universe. It is this code which protects commerce on the high seas, preserves contracts against revolutionary changes of government, prescribes the duties of neutrals in time of war, protects the persons of ambassadors and consuls, fixes the law of blockade, gives rules to civilized warfare, limits the right of search and preserves the freedom of the seas.

This great code, in the language of an American commentator, consists largely of a "collection of usages, customs and opinions, the growth of civilization and commerce."

When our English ancestors secured the great charter, that "no freeman should be deprived of life, liberty or property except by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land," the trial by jury rested upon custom, and the "law of the land" had no other definition than universal consent and immemorial usage.

When our American forefathers protested against taxation without representation, they pointed to no written law, but to the history of English civilization; to immemorial usage and the customs and canons of the common law.

But aside from the precedent to which we insist upon adhering, we object to the nomination of Gen. Grant because of the character of his former administrations. We will not willingly revive the story of their shortcomings. It is enough to say that heretofore they brought dishonor, shame and defeat to the Republican party; and no reasonable guarantees are offered that the future will be an improvement of the past. A nomination does not remove the odor of these scandals. It only shifts the responsibility upon the party itself.

"The river Rhine, it is well known,
Doth wash your city of Cologne;
But tell me, nymphs, what power divine
Shall henceforth wash the river Rhine!"

These gentlemen tell us that the condition of the country is such that a strong government is needed. The meaning of this term has never been sufficiently explained. If they seek a government made strong by the love and confidence of the people, or one made strong by the proper administration of the law, we shall be the last to present any objection. If, on the other hand, they seek the application of repressive measures to the South outside of the constitution and against the law, we enter now our most solemn protest. If the object be to dictate to the Southern people what representatives they shall send to congress, whether white or black, Republican or Democratic, we here repudiate the unwarrantable claim. We waged against them a war of four years' duration to compel them to send members of congress to Washington instead of to Richmond. If these leaders desire us to wage another four years' war to drive those members back to Richmond, we shall withhold our consent. If the purpose of our leaders be, in violation of constitutional guarantees, to send down armies of protection to the negro, while he votes the Republican ticket, we answer that standing armies are but sorry teachers of public opinion, and generally the worst guarantors of civil liberty—either for white or black. That this clamor for strong government is as baseless as all other pretensions put forth to overthrow the conservative safeguards of our institutions. It is sufficient to quote the words of General Grant himself. At Bloomington, Ill., on the 17th of April last, after informing the people that he had traveled over all the lately rebellious states, he said: "The same decorations were seen in every state that are seen here to-night; the Union flag floated over us everywhere, and the eyes of the people are as familiar with its colors as yours, and look upon it as guaranteeing to all the rights and privileges of a free people without regard to race, color, or previous condition of servitude." At Little Rock, two days before, he said he discovered that the sectional "feelings of the past are gone."

These declarations furnish sufficient answer to all claims of government outside of the law. There is no chattel slavery in the South, and there never can be again. Interest, conscience, custom, all forbid it. The slave block is abolished forever. There is, however, a species of slavery in the South as well as in the North that cries for the emancipation of its miserable victims. In truthful language we are told that "he is not free whose mind is enslaved;" and how many of our people consent to subject the right of judgment and the dictates of conscience to the shackles of party rule.

It has been said that he alone is free "whom the truth makes free."

Then he who smothers his convictions and advocates measures which his soul abhors, or supports for public office unworthy candidates, denies the truth and ceases to be free.

De Tocqueville truly says that the desire for office in America destroys the spirit of independence, stifles the manlier virtues and jeopardizes the existence of the state.

We all know that the theory and principles of our government are subverted by the present practices of political parties.

They have usurped the functions of all its departments. Conventions make presidents; conventions make legislatures and judges of courts; conventions are made by primary meetings, and primary meetings are too often controlled by bullies, blackguards and demagogues. Of late years, by extending the principle of state rights to the work of professional politicians, they have adopted what they denominate the unit rule, by which the vote of a single trickster may control an entire state. In order to make this work effective they resort to all the arts of corruption. They employ professional voters for the primaries, who are equally active and zealous for either party. They employ professional delegates who sell their services for lucre, or the empty promise of office.

When the nominations are made they demand the support of honest men; they appeal to the fears of some; to the prejudices of others; to the avarice of some and the aspirations of others, while they apply the party lash to all.

Instead of electing our president by colleges of independent electors, these fraudulent conventions, manipulated and controlled by the worst elements of society, not only dictate the person of the executive, but the character and policy of his administration. These are the evils from which we need emancipation. They belong no less to one party than to the other.

Strong government is not the remedy for them. For them we need no standing armies, no military hero, no methods of military rule.

The very reverse of all these is required. We want personal independence, respect for the constitution and the laws, a total overthrow of party rule, an emancipation of the public mind from the thraldom of party machinery.

It is by means of these arts, this perversion of all methods of good government, that the nomination of Gen. Grant is now threatened. Consecrated customs are to be put aside, the example of good men is to be insolently spurned, and a nomination forced upon an unwilling party.

With the exception of the State of Pennsylvania, the states proposing to nominate him cannot give him an electoral vote. Pennsylvania was secured upon a three-weeks' notice; and so reckless and defiant is the misrepresentation of the popular will that the public judgment already proclaims revolt. Long before the Chicago convention assembles, the glittering falsehood will have been exposed, and truth will assert its supremacy.

Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin, it is now certain, cannot be relied on for a single electoral vote in case of his nomination. If the electoral vote of New York should be given by an act of the legislature, the revolutionary proceeding would cost double as many votes in other states. Illinois is now doubtful in its choice for a nomination, and almost certain to oppose his election if nominated.

Under these circumstances we may the more confidently appeal to the Chicago convention.

To make that appeal becomes a part of the duty devolved upon this meeting. Let us make it in a spirit of sincerity; let us remind our friends of our joint labors in the past; of the many good deeds of the party in which we have all participated and of its splendid renown, of which we are all proud. Let us ask them to reconsider and disavow their purposes. If they prove deaf to the voice of justice, and reject the claims of past association, we may be reluctantly forced to acquiesce in the necessity which demands our political separation. In that event it may become necessary to declare that all political connection between them and ourselves is and ought to be totally dissolved, and that as a free and independent party we have full power to call conventions, to nominate candidates, and to do all other acts and things which an independent party may of right do.

It is now customary to deride us as weak and contemptible in numbers. The race is not always to the swift nor the battle to the strong. More than once in human history the weak have been able to confound the mighty.

A few earnest men pursuing the right, soon become irresistible. "Duties are theirs, events are God's." In the language of Mr. Carlyle, "they perform the duty nearest to them, and then other duties become clearer."

The Liberty party of 1844, headed by Mr. Birney, received only 62,300 votes out of more than two and a half millions cast. But this was sufficient to turn the scale and bring defeat upon Mr. Clay, the most popular civic leader known to American politics.

The Free-soilers of New York, under Mr. Van Buren, in 1848, overwhelmed the victorious Democracy and drove them from power. Earnest men are always in the majority. They see the right and suffer no timid counsels or cowardly suggestions to stand between them and duty. This little Liberty party of 1844 became the party of Lincoln in 1860.

In the last century a few earnest patriots at Boston epitomized human liberty into the maxim: "No taxation without representation." To them the maxim was as sacred as the religion of their fathers. They inscribed the principle on their banners, and followed the flag amidst the scorn and contempt of the flatterers and minions of power. These were the men who organized the first tea-party* known in American history. Those who tumbled the tea into Boston harbor numbered only fifty men. At Concord and Lexington they numbered an army; and there they fired the shot whose echoes awaked mankind. The first

* The Globe-Democrat in indicating the Anti-Third Term Party of Missouri, gave it the name of the "Tea Party."

tea-party gave us our institutions. Let us hope that the second may be able to preserve them.

We may not be able to elect a president of our own choosing in the next canvass, but we can and do proclaim that the balance of power is in our hands. We can determine which candidate chosen by others shall be elected, and we have already resolved to exercise that power.

The methods of existing political parties must be reformed or the parties themselves must cease to exist.

The old issues have become useless for good.

The questions on which parties were organized are now substantially settled. The war with all its passions and resentments, must be put away with the past. The constitution, with its amendments, is accepted as the supreme law, and this gives us a government sufficiently strong. The public faith must be preserved, and to do this settles the questions of commercial law. Prudence and economy, supplemented by good crops, have exposed recent heresies on the subject of finance and commended resumption to the judgment of all.

Errors of administration yet exist. The civil service is clumsy and corrupt. Political tricksters have become a governing class, and office-seeking has been reduced to a profession. The executive tenure must be reduced to a single term, either by law or by practice, to the end that the scandals of patronage may cease. The tyranny of party must be broken, and personal independence asserted. If a party nomination must continue to be equivalent to an election, the nomination must have such safeguards as will secure a proper selection.

Permit us to indulge our reverence and respect for the traditions of the past. You may call it a superstition, if you will. It has grown with our growth, and strengthened with our strength. To honor our fathers is a commandment of the Christian religion. So far this superstition has given us liberty, civilization, progress, wealth, happiness, government, law. It has preserved to us the union of our fathers. We love it with all its recollections, and we would perpetuate it as we knew it in the days of our infancy:

The union of lakes, the union of lands,
The union of states none can sever;
The union of hearts, the union of hands,
And the flag of our union forever.

The Chairman announcing that the convention was organized and ready for business, Mr. F. W. Whitridge read from the platform the following, which he had been instructed to present:

INDEPENDENT REPUBLICAN HEADQUARTERS. }
UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK, May 3. }

The executive committee of Independent Republicans of New York State offer to the convention at St. Louis hearty sympathy and co-operation in their opposition to the renomination of Gen. Grant for a third term. We believe that Gen. Grant ought not to be nominated at Chicago, because his nomination would array against the Republican party the overwhelming opposition to the violation of the unwritten law against a third term; because the record of his previous administration condemns his candidacy, and because, under such management as is associated with his name, would be defeated at the polls as it would then deserve to be defeated. The party managers in this State who have hesitated at nothing to make the State convention servile to their will, have falsely endeavored to represent New York as a unit for Gen. Grant. The Republicans of New York are not a unit for Gen. Grant. We believe a majority of them oppose his nomination. We believe that in the event of his candidacy a Republican third candidate should be put in the field unless the Democratic candidate should be one so commanding the confidence of the country as to make this course questionable, and we shall heartily co-operate in well-considered plans to this end, especially should they include vigorous efforts in unison with the rest of the party for the election of a Republican majority in the House, that in the event of the election of a Democratic executive he should be supported in measures of sound finance and administrative reform but not in partisan measures. We believe that no candidate should be nominated at Chicago who will in any way put the party on the defensive, and we look to the result of the convention at St. Louis by protesting against one threatened blunder to promote the nomination of a candidate who will fully represent political morality and the avowed principles of the party and who ought to and will win.

HORACE WHITE,
J. SCHOENHOF,
H. S. VANDUZER.

FELIX KAUFMAN,
Dr. S. S. GREY,
R. R. BONNER,

GEORGE W. GREEN,
F. W. WHITRIDGE,
W. A. WHITE.

Mr. E. R. Wood, of Philadelphia, also read as follows:

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN LEAGUE,
OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
No. 913 Walnut street, Philadelphia.

To the St. Louis Anti-Third Term Convention:

The National Republican League of Pennsylvania, in sending a delegate to the St. Louis Convention, desires to express its hearty concurrence in the objects of that body.

The motto of the League, "No third term—A party without a master and a candidate without a stain," embodies the principles on which it is founded, and which it believes will influence a sufficient number of Republicans to turn the scale in the pending election. But to accomplish this will require organization, and the League hopes the convention may not adjourn without providing means by which such an organization may be constituted, in case the action of the Chicago Convention be such as to give the party a candidate who cannot be supported by conscientious and thoughtful Republicans.

Believing that the abuse of patronage is the source of our political demoralization, the League ventures to express the hope that the St. Louis Convention will earnestly demand of the Republican party that it place civil service reform among its leading principles.

The League hails the assembling of the St. Louis Convention as a most encouraging evidence that the people are at last becoming aroused by the multiplying evils of our political condition, and are rapidly becoming prepared to adopt the only remedy—that of emancipation from the blind partisanship which has rendered party organization the tool of unscrupulous managers.

By order of the executive committee.

WM. ROTCH WISTER, Chairman.

HAMPTON L. CARSON, Secretary.

The Secretary, Col. Guilbert, read the following communications:

To the National Anti-Third Term Republican Convention at St. Louis.

We the undersigned Republican voters of the State of Iowa, being strongly opposed to a third presidential term by any one, however distinguished, and anxiously desiring escape from the now utterly needless alternative of support to a candidate for such service or acquiescence in the infliction of a greater evil, respectfully express to your convention our intensely earnest sympathy with its avowed purpose of preventing, if at all possible, the threatened misfortune to the Republican party of a third-term nomination at Chicago. We are thus in sympathy with you for these among other reasons:

1. We are convinced that, as a matter of principle, and as a measure of safety for the future, the traditional law of the Republic of a two-term service only in the Presidency by the same citizen, should not be departed from.

2. Daily accumulating developments leave no room to doubt that the opposition to a third-term, on the part of tried and true Republicans, is so widely extended and so deep-seated, as to render a third-term nomination extremely if not fatally hazardous to Republican success next November.

3. Our knowledge of the views and feelings of a very large number of Republicans in this State, convince us that even in radical and heretofore immovably Republican Iowa, the proposed nomination of General Grant for a third-term, will very greatly endanger and probably defeat the election of Republican candidate for Congress in the First, Second and Third Districts in this State, if in none other.

4. While according to General Grant, as we gladly do, all possible honor in view of his past service to the Nation in the field and at the Capital, and yielding to none in our admiration for his many excellencies of character, ability and patriotism, we cannot close our eyes to the obvious fact, that very serious objections are urged against his candidature for the Presidency, as a result of the numerous and grave mistakes and failures in civil administration alleged or committed during his past terms of service in the executive chair. These allegations are of such a character, and are so very strongly urged among and by reliable and conscientious Republicans, as to render it certain that the nomination of Gen. Grant will entail upon the Republican party a campaign of explanation, apology and defense at the precise juncture at which the blunders, reactionary efforts, treasonable designs and actual crimes of the Democratic majority in Congress invite and urge the Republican party to a campaign of defiant avowal, vigorous, aggressive and incessant attack.

5. We are confronted by the fact, too palpable to be ignored, and too serious in its portents to be without great influence in determining our present utterance in behalf of

the Republican party, that, should General Grant be nominated, while there are a large number of Republicans who would vote for him with great reluctance, and with mental if not expressed protest, there are many other Republicans, whose votes the party will greatly need next November, who will consider the defeat of a third-term nominee a smaller evil than his election. This fact exists. Hence, we urge especial attention to the danger it threatens to Republican unity and success. It has force in view of the certainty that the dissatisfied Republicans would find support thereto in such maxims as that of President Hayes, that "he serves his party best who serves his country well." We greatly fear that the number of Republican voters entertainig the views thus noted, is much larger than has heretofore been supposed. We fear, indeed, that it is sufficiently large to defeat Gen. Grant in some of the Northern States. At the same time we are firm in the belief that the suggestion that Gen. Grant can carry some of the Southern States, is altogether illusory and deceptive; for those States are hopelessly in the grasp, for the coming campaign, of a political organization which will not permit an honest and free vote by the entire people, and which would not allow a fair and true count of such a vote could it be cast. Because of the fetters thus placed upon the Southern people by the criminal action of the Democratic party, we are and must be the more solicitous to secure a Republican nomination which will not drive from its support the Northern voters upon which alone it must rely for success.

Impelled thereto by these reasons, the undersigned, being unable as a result of business and other engagements to attend your convention in person, thus present to you our assurances of deep interest in the objects we understand you are desiring to accomplish. As Republicans who are devoted to the grand old party, through whose agency the Republic has been saved from Treason, redeemed from slavery and placed on the highway of Progress and Wealth, and as citizens who deprecate above all else a control of this Nation by the Democratic party—a consummation we would oppose to the utmost—we earnestly desire that your convention will so wisely deliberate, and so unitedly and forcibly speak as that the National Republican organization may be spared the mistake, and the American Nation escape the disaster, of a third-term Presidential nomination at Chicago in June next.

April 26, 1880.

Respectfully Yours,

Edward Russell, J. P. Stibolt, H. Lischer, J. W. Thompson, Geo. H. French, H. H. Benson, H. H. Andressen, G. G. Carstens, R. Smitham, J. B. Fidlar, W. P. Speer, C. A. Ficke, J. W. Green, S. F. Smith, Nat. French, H. R. Clauissen, J. Scott Richman, Elias F. Chapin, Geo. W. Ells, W. H. Wilson, W. F. Peck, John E. Henry, J. D. Campbell, M. J. Rohlfs, and others, Davenport; G. B. Dennison, R. T. Thompson, F. R. Lewis, Geo. W. Dillaway, R. M. Burnett, and many others, Muscatine.

To the Chairman of the National Republican Anti-Third-Term Convention:

The Republican State Convention of Wisconsin being held about the same time as your convention at St. Louis, our citizens have given the former their particular attention, and secured, as far as the city and county of Milwaukee is concerned, *a unanimous Anti-Third-Term delegation*. To achieve this result, required the united efforts of all those in sympathy with the Anti-Third-Term Movement, and for this reason the St. Louis convention did not receive that attention which otherwise would have been given it. Appreciating the importance, however, of giving expression to the voice of Wisconsin on this subject, we, at this late hour, avail ourselves of this mode to express our heartiest sympathies with the objects of your convention, and to convey to you the assurance of our heartiest co-operation in your efforts to avert the threatening danger of a third term. Had time permitted, this letter would have received the signatures of thousands of our fellow citizens who earnestly desire the success of true Republican principles.

MILWAUKEE, May 5, 1880.

J H. TESCH,
H. M. MENDEL,
ED. ASHERMAN,
R. H. SABIN,
G. PATEK,
ANT THORMAEHOLEN,

GUIDO PFISTER,
WM. FRANKFURTH,
J. P. PHILIPS,
C. W. MILBRATH,
CLARENCE H. YOUNG,
AUG. FRANK,

FRED DOHENEN,

L. MASCHAUER,
E. J. LINDSAY,
T. F. BECHTEL,
M. ROTH,
TUL. GOLL,
C. A. MEISSNER,
LEO ROTH,

To the Independent Republican Convention at St. Louis, Mo.:

GENTLEMEN—The German-American Independent Republican Organization of New York beg to confirm the opinions expressed in the enclosed address and to add further:

They do not believe that the Chicago Republican Convention will seriously consider any address or resolutions protesting against the nomination of General Grant, unless that convention becomes convinced that General Grant, if nominated, will be defeated.

They do not believe that such conviction can be imparted to that body, unless an Independent Republican Convention will meet at Chicago previously to and at the time of the Regular Republican Convention, fully prepared to nominate a third candidate, in case the latter convention should nominate General Grant or any candidate whose honesty is not beyond suspicion.

And they do believe that if such a third candidate is a well-known citizen of undoubted ability and honesty, standing on the platform adopted by the Republican party in 1876, that the greater part, if not the whole, of the Republican party vote may be concentrated upon him so that he will be elected. Very respectfully,

H. WESENDON, President.

J. SCHOENHOF, Secretary.

NEW YORK, April 30, 1880.

UNION CENTRAL REPUBLICAN CLUB, OF HAMILTON CO., OHIO.

The members of the Central Union Republican club, of Hamilton county, Ohio, representing the mechanics of said county in assembly:

Resolved, That we regret to see a third-term presidential issue forced on the people of this country, and this club announces its earnest adherence to the Republican principles which limit the presidential services of any citizen to two terms, and which has been wisely illustrated by the example of George Washington, requiring that the tenure of the chief magistrate of the United States should not exceed a second term.

Resolved, That we are earnestly opposed to a third term for chief magistrate of the United States, and that in our opinion it will be detrimental to our Republican form of government.

THOS. J. CHARD, President,

CHAS. UMBERGER, Corresponding Sec'y.

MADISON, Wis., May 5, 1880.

To the Chairman of the National Republican Anti-Third-Term Convention, St. Louis:

The undersigned, delegates to the Republican state convention, most heartily sympathize with the object of your gathering in common with thousands of Republicans in every part of Wisconsin. We look upon a re-nomination of Gen. Grant as a calamity to the Republican party, and we join in your efforts to prevent such a result. We are sincere in the belief that a nomination of Gen. Grant would bring great disaster to the hitherto victorious cause of Republicanism in our state. But for the fact that our state convention is held about the same time of your convention, a fair representation from this state could have been expected; as it is, we have come to Madison in the same interest, believing that by so doing we can best serve the purpose we have in common with you in view.

(Signed.)

LEMUEL ELSWORTH,

CASPAR M. SANGER, Milwaukee county.

AUG. KICKBUSH,

many others.

JOHN J. SENN,

R. R. KEMPTER, Buffalo county.

K. I. MARKSTRUM, Maranthon county, and

GERMAN REPUBLICANS.

PHILADELPHIA, May 5.

To the President of the Anti-Third-Term Convention:

Believing with an overwhelming majority of the German-American Republicans of our country that the movement of the machine to force a third term for Gen. Grant, not because the country desires it, but because the machine demands it for its own purposes, we add our most earnest protest against his nomination. The objections to a third term as a dangerous precedent, and as contrary to the spirit of our institutions have often been so ably and forcibly presented, and are so unanswerable, that no words of ours but those of cordial endorsement can give them additional force. We would not in the least detract from the eminent military services of Gen. Grant; he will ever be held in grateful memory for them when we recall his lamentable failure as a civil administrator. The cry for a strong military man in time of profound peace; the tacit admission that the Republican party has but one man capable of being its standard-bearer, call for a determined protest from all lovers of their country. We demand strong civil administration pledged to honesty, economy and civil-service reform, and shall only support a candidate free from

taint or suspicion and from corrupt associations. We assure you and all those who think and act with you of our cordial co-operation.

RUDOLPH BLANKENBURG,
OSWALD SEIDENSTICKER,
JOSEPH KINKE,

Executive Committee of Pennsylvania German-American Branch of the National Republican League.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS,

PROVIDENCE, R. I., May 3, 1880.

To the Convention to be held at St. Louis, May 6, 1880:

The Young Republican club desires to be represented in your convention as opposed to the nomination of Ulysses S. Grant as candidate of the Republican party for President at the next presidential election. We believe it to be extremely doubtful whether he could receive the electoral vote of Rhode Island.

We are also strenuously opposed to the nomination of James G. Blaine.

At the last state election the bolters from the Republican party succeeded in depriving the regular Republican nominee for governor of an election by the people.

RICHARD B. COMSTOCK,
BENJ. I. WHEELER,

JOHN R. GLADDING,
WM. SHEAFE CHASE,

FREDERICK P. READ,
Executive Committee of the Young Republican Club of Rhode Island.

WILL NOT VOTE FOR GRANT.

NORTH MANCHESTER, Ind.

While adhering to the principles of the Republican party and earnestly desiring its success at the polls in November, we protest against the nomination of any man who is certain to lose the support of any important element of the party, and are therefore heartily in sympathy with the purpose named in the call made by your committee for a convention on the 6th inst. Out of a Republican vote of about two hundred in the town of North Manchester, we, the undersigned, are outspoken in our opposition to the renomination of Gen. U. S. Grant for so many and such obvious reasons that we shall not undertake to herein enumerate them. We each and all will refuse to vote for Gen. Grant, even if he succeed in getting the Chicago nomination, and believe that many more Republicans of our town, while not so outspoken as ourselves, will not vote for him if nominated; and we believe that our town is not an exception, but a fair representative of the feeling in the state of Indiana in regard to Gen. Grant's candidacy. We hope that the convention to be held at St. Louis on the 6th inst. will make provisions for a national convention of Liberal Republicans to be held in case Gen. Grant secures the nomination at Chicago to place candidates for president and vice-president in nomination to whom we can lend our support. Regretting our inability to attend your convention in a body, we are respectfully yours, Geo. W. Gunder, A. A. McKain, D. S. Miller, Thompson Arnold, A. Miller, James N. Brady, G. W. Eichholtz, O. C. Rife, F. W. Green, A. W. Bowman, E. C. C. Olunant, Henry Gunder, J. S. Andrews.

May 4, 1880.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

Henry Hitchcock moved the appointment by the chair of a committee of thirteen to draft resolutions, and that all resolutions touching the subject of platform be referred to that committee.

The motion carried and the chair appointed the following as such committee: Henry Hitchcock, St. Louis; Bluford Wilson, Illinois; R. A. Hill, Indiana; J. E. Scripps, Michigan; J. W. Carter, Massachusetts; F. W. Whitridge, New York; L. H. Dembity, Kentucky; E. R. Wood, Pennsylvania; R. E. Rombauer, St. Louis; W. W. Williams, Minnesota; B. B. Cahoon and Fred Muench of Missouri, and J. H. Welch of Florida.

The secretary read a resolution offered by E. W. Fox, declaring against the candidacy of Gen. Grant and calling for a convention at Philadelphia, to place a third ticket in the field in the event of Gen. Grant's nomination at Chicago; also one offered by W. H. Jones of Ohio. Both were referred to the committee on resolutions.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Maj. Lucien Eaton then read a large number of letters received in answer to invitations to take part in the convention. When his voice gave out, he was relieved by Rev. John Snyder. The correspondence was as follows:

FROM THURLOW WEED.

NEW YORK, April 18, 1880.

GENTLEMEN—I am in receipt of your invitation to attend Anti-Third-Term Republican Convention to be held at St. Louis on the 6th of May. Approving as I do most cordially of the objects of your convention, I would gladly participate in its deliberations, but the infirmities incident to old age render that impracticable. I must content myself, therefore, with an earnest expression of hope that your patriotic efforts, combined with the efforts of Republicans in other States, may rescue the government and country from impending danger. The influences that will inforce Gen. Grant's nomination, should such a nomination be made, will insure his defeat. The premature call of our State convention, coupled with the methods by means of which a muzzled delegation was appointed, rendered the success of our ticket at least doubtful. If delegates thus chosen here act with delegates from States sure to cast their electoral vote against Grant, his defeat in this State becomes inevitable. Will our Republican friends in States "solid" for Democracy, if seasonably admonished, deliberately involve themselves with us in a common calamity? If Gen. Grant should be nominated, he will be indebted not to the popular sentiment in Republican States, but to Senators Conkling, Cameron and Logan, aided by a "solid" vote of delegates from States whose presidential electors will cast a "solid" vote against their nominee. In this aspect of the question, I cling to the hope, either that the three distinguished senators named will discover in season that they cannot afford to be held responsible for the election of a Democratic president, or that the real friends of Gen. Grant, when the glamour of ovations calculated to mislead him have subsided, by revealing the whole and exact truth, induce the withdrawal of his name.

Respectfully, yours,

THURLOW WEED.

FROM PRESIDENT WOOLSEY.

To EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary of the Anti-third Term Convention:

The "Father of his country" was urged to accept an election for a third-term, and persistently refused, although there were weightier reasons for his making the opposite decision than there have been at any time since he left the presidential chair. The course which he took gave rise to one of the very few political habits of the United States, and it is the only one which relates to the conduct of candidates for the presidential chair. Are there good reasons for adhering to this habit, or does it grow out of blind reverence for an illustrious man, and nothing more? I am so sure that it is founded on deep conviction in regard to the highest policy of the country, that if it were to be broken through, I should at once hope that attempts would be made to restrict the tenure of the president's office to a single term by a constitutional provision.

One great reason for clinging to the habit is, that, if it were given up, there would be increased danger that the general government would fall into the hands of a faction within a party. Government by party there must be, although the parties may agree in many of their principles and much of their policy. But government by a clique will arise when persons in official stations, with their subordinates distributed over a country, make it their great aim to continue in office, and bind the chief magistrate to themselves by working for his success. The life and purity of politics consist in breaking up such cliques after they have had their brief day of success. A third-term president is a clique's new lease of office. And this at length works its own cure; for it cools other political aspirants within the same party, or provokes them to combine against the controlling faction, and disgusts all honest and right-thinking men. Thus while a third term would be advocated, as a continuance in power of the same party, it would probably be the deepest injury which a party or its leaders could inflict on its permanence.

But, again, if this habit were overthrown, a president himself might have hopes of a new term, and might be in danger of making corrupt bargains with his friends and partisans. The increase in strength of personal motives necessarily weakens uprightness in administration, and this, again, disaffects the better members of a party. A president who obviously wants, or is wanted, by his friends to have the highest office for a third term, goes into his office under renewed obligations to old friends, which are too strong for most minds to feel and yet be perfectly honest in public administration. Thus, in a democratic republic especially, great evils would attend elections to the highest office for the third time.

I do not, indeed, see any great reason to apprehend that a third term would open the way to a bold, bad man of seizing on the government as a tyrant, and getting himself confirmed by a plebiscite. But I regard it as a link in the chain of corruption that we must look as our chief source of public evil to a body of active, intriguing politicians on the one hand, and to a mass of passive citizens on the other, who let political questions take their course, if they only are not interfered with in their business and callings.

THEODORE D. WOOLSEY.

FROM THE EDITOR OF THE SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., April 6, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Secretary Anti-Third-Term Convention, St. Louis:

DEAR SIR—I am in receipt of your letter and circular of the 2d, and beg to say that your movement in opposition to the third term has my hearty support as a private citizen and as a journalist. * * *

The anti-third-term sentiment is very strong in this state and there can be little doubt that we shall send anti-Grant delegates to the Chicago Convention.

Yours very truly,

SAMUEL BOWLES.

FROM MURAT HALSTEAD.

Ex-Senator HENDERSON:

CINCINNATI, May 5, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR—I think the convention will lose force if it does not confine itself strictly to hostility to third-termism. Under the conditions of the country a vote for a third term will be a vote to confer the presidency upon Gen. Grant for life, with an invitation to him to drop the forms of election as soon as convenient, and an urgent suggestion that he shall, whatever happens, declare himself elected and take the office, which he is to magnify according to his will.

If the Republican party adopts this programme by the nomination of Grant it will be a Grant party—nothing more. The highest office in the government one can hope to attain after that is that of favorite. Assume that the powers arrayed for Grant succeed we shall not, of course, have the forms of monarchy, but all the evils and none of the good of that mode of government. Deadly hostilities to these tendencies and possibilities is not necessarily personal to Grant; it is loyalty above all considerations of individuals and organizations to Republican principles.

The third-term issue is large enough. It should not be mixed with any smaller matters. There should be no discrimination against any candidate with the exception of ex-president, and we should draw the line on him that Washington and Jefferson drew on themselves.

If the Republican party emerges from Chicago the third-term party, war should be declared upon it, and the object of this convention should be to make ready for that contingency. There should be no other issue made or suggested. Many would perhaps be pleased to pose as civil service reformers, but I do not believe in reform that in theory contemplates an official class, and in practice gives the political power of the States of New York and Pennsylvania into the hands of enemies whose vanity it is to hold the administration in contempt.

Massachusetts has set a bad example in coupling the name of Blaine with that of Grant. Let Blaine alone. He is doing brave work against the third-term treason, and would be churlish not to give him credit for it. I suppose he is a sinner, but I would forgive him his sins for this good work, and give him the glory of it.

M. HALSTEAD.

S. D. BINGHAM OF MICHIGAN.

Hon. J. B. Henderson :

LANSING, Mich., May 4, 1880.

DEAR SIR—

* * * * * Michigan will do her whole duty by sending a delegation to Chicago that will oppose the nomination of a third-term candidate, as unwise and dangerous to success—for which we are all working.

I trust the action of your convention will be dignified and manly, and that the result will be felt at Chicago. No attack should be made upon any candidate, and no threats of a bolt in case the wishes of the convention are not complied with.

I do not think Gen. Grant will be nominated. Yours truly,

S. D. BINGHAM.

BETTER CALL A HALT.

PADUCAH, KY., April 1, 1880.

DEAR SIR—I heartily approve the action proposed in the resolutions you enclose. I shall do all in my power to promote the end desired by the organization of the anti-third term movement. If Grant is to be the nominee of the Republican party, then it is time that opposition to such folly should make itself felt. Even if elected, with the influences which will inevitably surround Grant, the Republican party could not survive another of his administrations. We had better call a halt now, before we are committed beyond redemption.

I fear I shall not be able to attend your convention, but I hope the line of conduct we shall pursue, in the event Grant is nominated, will be unequivocally announced—not in spirit of menace, but as the conclusion of our deliberate convictions.

The general impression here, among thinking Republicans, is, that if Grant is nominated he will be defeated, unless the Democrats nominate Tilden or commit some other equally egregious blunder. The opposition here is stronger against Grant than against a third term.

Very Respectfully,

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary, etc., St. Louis, Mo.

E. W. BAGBY.

• FROM FRED HASSAUREK.

CINCINNATI, May 1, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq.—DEAR SIR: I am opposed to the nomination of Gen Grant or any other presidential candidate for a third term. I do not even believe that a president should be elected for a second term. No act or expression of President Hayes has met with such general and unqualified approval as his announcement in the beginning, that he would under no circumstances, be a candidate for re-election. The unanimity with which the country has acquiesced in this his original pledge, in spite of his irreproachable administration, clearly proves the people's belief in the correctness of the principle upon which his prospective refusal was based. I hope the day is not far distant, when this general belief will take the shape of a constitutional amendment, extending the term of the office of president and prohibiting the re-election of its incumbent.

It has become fashionable in some circles to sneer at the opposition to a third term as a superstition. Under this superstition, however, our institutions have been strengthened and preserved. With this superstition our country has become great and remained free. If it be superstition to cherish a proper reverence for the teachings and the example of the fathers of the republic, I can only say let this superstition be maintained. I am superstitious enough to believe that Gen. Washington was a greater man than Gen Grant.

My best wishes for the success of your convention, I have the honor to remain yours very truly,

F. HASSAUREK.

ANY REPUBLICAN BETTER THAN GRANT

WILMINGTON, N. C., April 15, 1880.

DEAR SIR—The movement that you have inaugurated has my entire sympathy, and in whatever way I can aid you will give me very great pleasure to do so. I am opposed to the third term. I am in favor of any Republican in preference to Gen. Grant, not because I am opposed to the individual, but I am against the policy of overriding the unwritten law concerning the third term. * * * Very truly, yours,

W. P. CANNDAY.

FROM EX-SENATOR FENTON.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., May 3, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR—

* * * I approve of the object of the meeting as I understand it. I am opposed to Gen. Grant's nomination, both because of its third-term character and because, also, for other reasons, I think it would put in peril our party success. * * *

Very respectfully yours,

R. E. FENTON.

HON. JNO. B. HENDERSON, St. Louis:

NOT FIT TO BE MADE.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 16, 1880.

FRED. T. LEDERGERBER, Secretary:

DEAR SIR—The circular of your committee is at hand and meets a most hearty response from myself and numerous others, who want the Republican party to exist in the future as in the past, the party of liberty. If, as is claimed by the third-terminers, "we need a strong man," his name is not Gen. Grant. We had more outrages and lost more elections in any one year of his last four years' "reign" than in all the other eleven years I have resided here. All we require is an open field for truth, and that we now have, and are sure of Florida under any other leader than Grant. I cannot and will not undertake to canvass the state to make apologies for a nomination "not fit to be made." We have numerous capable statesmen upon whom we can call to fill the presidential chair. I leave for a conference with leading members of the party this morning, and will advise you if we can send a delegate to the convention.

We are a poor people and have long distances to travel in our own state, and the state convention meeting in early May will absorb our available material for delegates.

The Grant bulldozers are moving earth and hell here to get an indorsement of their candidate from the convention. We do not think they will succeed.

My advices from the East and North point toward the defeat of three terms.

Yours,

S. C. COBB.

NO REASON FOR A THIRD TERM.

AUSTIN, Texas, May 1, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary Executive Committee Anti-Third-Term Party, S. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—I am in hearty sympathy with the objects of the convention. I am unalterably opposed to a third term for any man, and I can see no reason why Gen. Grant should be again elected president. I refused to support him for a second term and joined with the Liberal Republicans in 1872 to secure his defeat, and if it had not been for the treachery of the Democracy the nation would have been saved much of the disgrace brought upon it by his administration. If two terms were sufficient for Washington, it certainly should be for Grant. In fact, I have always believed that the presidential term of office should be extended to six years, and an amendment to the national constitution should be adopted preventing any man from being elected to that office a second time.

But if there were no objection to a third term, I can see no reason why Gen. Grant should be again elected to the office of president. His previous administration was a by-word and a reproach, and a very stink in the nostrils of honest men. He went into office when the great Republican party was in the zenith of its power and glory. He left office when he and his administration had brought that party to the very verge of defeat and disgrace. The very men—the whiskey thieves and corruptionists—the machine politicians, who brought disgrace and infamy upon his previous administrations, are now the ones who are demanding and clamoring for his nomination again, that they may once more revel in their rascalities.

I cast my first vote in 1854 in Pennsylvania for the last nominee of the old Whig party in that state for governor, and for twenty-six years I have opposed the Democratic party, but I earnestly feel that it would be better for the country and better for the Republican party that Grant should be defeated if his nomination is forced on the party, than that we should have success with him as our candidate. Much as I would deplore the success of the so-called Democratic party, and regret the defeat of the Republicans, I believe the country and the Republican party could better stand four years of Democratic rule than it

could another four years of Grant, and these I believe are the sentiments of very many of the best and most intelligent Republicans in Texas.

I trust the convention may be a great success, that its deliberations may be harmonious and that it may be the means of averting the disastrous defeat of the Republican party, that will surely follow the nomination of Gen. Grant as its candidate. Very truly yours.

W. Y. LEADER,
Editor Daily Dispatch.

DON'T LIKE THE COMPANY.

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., April 17, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—I ought to say, in candor, that while I am decidedly opposed to the renomination of Gen. Grant, I do not, individually, feel any objection to nominating any satisfactory candidate for a third term. I do not share the sentiment on that point which is felt by many wise and good men. The fact that it is felt so generally is, however, a strong argument against the nomination of Gen. Grant. * * *

My objection to it arises mainly from the bad political company which the General keeps. For him I have a great respect. With thanks for the invitation, I am

Very truly yours,
H. THAYER.

FROM REV. DR. BELLOWS.

232 EAST FIFTEENTH ST., N. Y.

}
April 30, 1880. }

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary National Republican Anti-Third Term, etc.:

DEAR SIR—I regret not to be able to share in *person* the meeting on the 6th of May, but it costs little time or trouble to send my *opinion*, of little importance as it may be, to an assembly of brains and worth and patriotism, such as I am sure yours will be.

I am opposed from strong conviction to the third term of any man. The third term means *no limit* to the occupation of the presidential chair, if the ambition of the possessor wishes to hold it, and the people consent, when they are strong to prevent, until they are weakened by acquiescence and have lost the power to contend with the machine which strengthens with uninterrupted possession of all the innumerable offices in the gift of the administration. There is no radical means of preventing this, except the one-term rule (make the term six years if you will), which President Hayes deserves the credit of having voluntarily committed himself to, and of having honorably adhered to. This purpose has made him to the extent of his power a civil-service reformer, and all that is highly creditable in his administration centers round his reform in the New York custom-house, the old hub of the machine in New York.

And when the third term connects itself, as it does in the approaching election, with a military man, whose name and fame are chiefly that of a soldier, I object with an added alarm and a more resolute resistance. Every argument used in favor of Gen. Grant's election or nomination is with me an argument against it.

First—He put down the rebellion!

Is it to put down rebellions that presidents are to be chosen in peaceful times? Then, alas, we surrender all our boast—of a country safe in its laws and its people's love; in its freedom and its preference for its own constitution! Are we ready to confess that we have sunk into the condition of a Mexican or South American province and rely on our arms for our ordinary safety?

It is dangerous to say as much as that General Grant put down the rebellion. The people put it down under a president that selected a competent general to do the people's will.

Now, you wish to have the president and the general in the same skin. It was a mistake to make Gen. Grant president once; it was a folly to make him president twice; it will be a madness, if not a crime, to make him president for a third term. Heaven knows we want no voting by platoons! The machinery and the necessities of war are the precise reverse of all the virtues and habits required in peace. To obliterate *individuality* is the very object of the uniform; to restore it and maintain it, of the citizen's coat, of all colors and shades. Epaulets in the presidential chair are an anomaly and mean spurs in

the saddle, where the people are ridden. Third-term presidents tend to become princes and are tyrants in the making.

It is not, however, the ambition of Gen. Grant or any other soldier that is to be most dreaded; it is the madness and stupidness of the people led by party fuglemen, who mistake an available for a desirable or a safe candidate.

Second—The chief argument for Grant's nomination is that he can be elected! If that is his best claim it is one dangerous to encourage. I object to putting forward this claim so unblushingly. It means that the people of the United States have resigned the hope or expectation of putting the man they choose and are obliged to have the man that circumstances render eligible. This is a confession of failure in our Republican principles which it is mortifying to accept and which we repudiate. Respectfully yours,

HENRY W. BELLows.

JOHN T. RUNYAN, N. J.

KEYPORT, April 6, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Secretary:

DEAR SIR—New Jersey is opposed to the third-term business. I have been selected by the Republicans of this township to represent them at the state convention, which meets in Trenton, May 6, and would say that we passed resolutions opposing the third term. * * * Yours, &c. JOHN T. RUNYAN.

WHAT CARL SCHURZ SAYS.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON:—You need not fear that I shall remain silent and inactive when the real tug of war comes, if it does come. As to my post of duty under such circumstances, my mind is fully made up. * * * CARL SCHURZ.

JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

JAMAICA PLAIN, Mass., May 2, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR—* * * If the Republican party is so mad as to nominate Grant, after all their experience of his past administration, I shall see nothing before them but defeat and disaster. They will then, to please the machine, throw away an almost certain prospect of victory under any good man. Is it not paying rather heavily in order to please Conkling and Cameron? Yours very truly, JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

HON. JOHN B. HENDERSON, St. Louis.

BRIEF DISPATCHES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 5, 1880.

To HON. JOHN B. HENDERSON, St. Louis:

Public duty keeps me here. My belief is that no citizen, whatever his public service and however much he may be endeared to our people by reason of his great and noble qualities as a soldier or statesman, can or ought to be elected a third time president of this republic. The experiment will be disastrous to the party and particularly to the candidate that thus attempts to brave public opinion. * * * BEN. BUTTERWORTH.

WM. R. MOORE, MEMPHIS.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., April 12, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Secretary, &c., ST. LOUIS, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—I am not engaged in politics, but feel, nevertheless, as a private citizen and business man, a very deep interest in the question at issue. Born, reared, and always identified in interest and by family ties, with the Southern section of our common country, I have, notwithstanding, ever voted the Republican ticket in opposition to all my relatives, neighbors, &c., and done, in addition, all that I could, to preserve intact the rich heritage bequeathed to us in the, to me, sacred Union, handed down to us by the "Fathers of the Republic." I voted for Lincoln, Grant and Hayes, and yield to no one now in loyalty and gratitude to Gen. Grant for the great services he has rendered to his and my country. But with all this I feel that I in no way detract from his grand character by now declining to place him in a position which would, I feel, do great violence as well to

my own sense of patriotism as the sacred cause which he has so nobly served, and which can be preserved, I think, by an adherence to the landmarks of our history, as laid down by Washington and Jefferson and Jackson, and the many others to whom we have been taught to look for safe political guidance. I deem it of the first importance that we should select a candidate whose political acts in the past will not in the coming campaign place us on the defensive. We have several able Republicans talked of for the presidency whose records, in case of a nomination, will require constant explanations and defence. Let's avoid them and take one whose past course defends itself.

Very respectfully,

Wm. R. Moore.

MADISON, Wis., May 5, 1880.

To EMORY S. FOSTER, Secretary Anti-Third-Term Convention, St. Louis:

Republican convention declared against third-term by electing nineteen anti-Grant men to one in his favor. W. W. COLEMAN, *Daily and Weekly Herald*.

W. W. COLEMAN, *Daily and Weekly Herald.*

WILL REFUSE TO VOTE.

PHILADELPHIA, April 12, 1880.

GENTLEMEN—I heartily approve of the contents of your circular and sincerely hope your convention of May 6 may meet with the success which it deserves. In my opinion the Republicans of Pennsylvania are decidedly opposed to the nomination of Gen. Grant again, and if the leaders of the party should, by force, be able to make him the nominee, a very respectable proportion of the usual followers will remain away from the polls. * * *

Very truly yours,

SAM'L W. PENNYPACKER.

LEMON THOMPSON, ALBANY.

NEW YORK, Apr. 30.

FRED. T. LEDERGERBER, Esq.:

* * * * * * * * * * I fully sympathize with the object of the meeting as set forth in the call dated St. Louis, March 25, 1880. I sincerely feel that such a meeting is highly necessary and proper. I should be very glad to take part in it; I should feel that I was discharging a patriotic duty. The renomination of Gen. Grant would be a great calamity, both to the country and the Republican party. I could not consent to support him, and there are tens of thousands of other Republicans who would feel and act the same. Gen. Grant's nomination is being planned and urged by a class of dishonest and corrupt machine politicians who do not represent the people or the party, and Gen. Grant has put himself in the hands of these men, who, by appealing to his ambition and love of power, are leading him blindly to his own and his country's destruction. If the Republican convention should nominate Gen. Grant and the Democratic convention should nominate Samuel J. Tilden I could not support either of them; I would be in favor in such a case of nominating a third man. I know of no man who would awaken more enthusiasm and satisfy the best element of both parties better than Benj. A. Bristow of Kentucky. I hope that the St. Louis convention will make provisions for such a contingency.

Very truly yours,

LEMON THOMPSON.

W. W. WILLIAMS, MINNESOTA.

ALBERT LEA, MINN., April 26, 1880.

M. L. E. S. FOSTER:

SIR—Yours of the 22d received. I intend to be with you on the 6th if I can possibly do so. My heart is in the work and I want to see it succeed. We are getting up a local organization here; it numbers 123 after one day's canvass, all Republicans and many of them Scandinavians, almost all of whom say they will not vote for Grant if he be nominated. I am in the fight, and propose to neither give nor take quarter, but to fight it out on this line, and I much prefer defeat with a good candidate than success with a bad one.

Yours truly,

W. W. WILLIAMS'

FROM GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS.

The following dispatch from George William Curtis, Esq., dated at New' Brighton, Staten Island, was received by the executive committee on the 4th inst.:

"I am unable to come to St. Louis, but I sympathize with all Republicans who under present circumstances oppose a third-term nomination. I see no good reason in the condition of public affairs for endangering the success of the Republican party by committing it unnecessarily to the overthrow of a sound and conservative tradition of the government, which has been formally accepted by the party in many States, and which has never been questioned or violated.

GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS."

AGAINST GRANT ON ANY TERMS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 25, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., or F. T. LEDERGERBER, Secretary Anti-Third-Term Convention:

DEAR SIR—I regret that I cannot attend the anti-third-term convention at St. Louis. As I have once before written on another occasion, I am so opposed to a third term, that I should oppose it even if Washington or Lincoln were the candidate, and so opposed to the renomination of Gen. Grant that I should object to it even were the third-term question not involved. Very truly yours,

THOS. WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

FROM A FRIEND OF GRANT.

NEW YORK, April 26.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq., Chairman:

DEAR SIR—* * * I have long been a friend of Gen. Grant, and am so still. I joined the late A. T. Stewart and others of this city in the first request to the general to allow his name to be presented as a candidate for the presidency. Now I am ready to join in a request that he shall do himself the great honor to be the first to refuse the office of President, and thus set at rest the hearts of his Republican friends..

Yours most respectfully,

WM. H. WEBB.

FOR A STRONG DECLARATION.

PHILADELPHIA, April 17, 1880.

FRED. T. LEDERGERBER, Esq., S. W. corner, Fifth and Olive streets, St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—* * * I hope there may be issued such a strong, clear, manly, temperate declaration of principles as will cause those inconsiderate advocates of the third term to pause ere they attempt to force upon the country such an evil as would most assuredly ensue upon the renomination of Gen. Grant. He has done the country much service, and he has been honored thereby; let him not press it, and himself, into serious trouble by a vaulting ambition. Very respectfully,

NATH. E. JANNEY.

HOPES FOR SUCCESS.

HILLSBORO, ILL., May 3, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—* * * It was my good fortune to be present at Jackson, Michigan, July 6, 1854, when the Republican party was named, and have been a stalwart ever since. I belong to the somewhat numerous class of Republicans who have a decided prejudice against a third term. In the event of Gen. Grant's nomination, we shall have to face the following dilemma:

(1) We can help elect Gen. Grant, for whom we have a high respect and admiration, but in doing so we must discard a wholesome precedent which we deem of much value; or, (2) we can help defeat Gen. Grant. This would put a final extinguisher on third-termism, but it would involve the serious effect of turning the government over to the control of a party we profoundly distrust.

Let us see whether there is any escape from these alternatives. I think there is a growing recognition of the fact that we have the best and purest government, when the three powers, president, senate and house, are not all in the hands of one party. If the senate were chiefly Republican, I think we might extinguish third-termism at the cost of a Democratic president, and deem it a good bargain. We of the ranks care little who divide the spoils.

But, unfortunately, the senate is not Republican. What the next house of representatives will be cannot be known till after the presidential election. But the defeat of a third-

term president is quite consistent with the choice of a Republican house. It might even be made in some small degree to promote that result—for many Democrats, as well as Republicans, confess the ill effects of intrusting all the powers to one party. Between third-termism and complete Democratic rule I should submit, with an ill-grace, to a third-term. But with a reasonable assurance of a Republican house, I incline to the other horn of the dilemma.

With the highest esteem for Gen. Grant, who has twice had my suffrage, I am just now half angry with him for not perceiving that the new honor which the nation seems ready to lay at his feet is offered at a cost which the nation can ill afford. Apart from personal and temporary aspects, it must be as plain to him, as to say, that the traditional limitation on the tenure of the office forms a safe and wholesome rule; and that the nation would be the poorer for the sacrifice of a prescription which it has taken a century to establish. If there existed an emergency which he alone could adequately fill, the case would be different.

The suggestion of Caesarism as connected with Gen. Grant is too absurd for discussion. Yet it is plain that if, in the near or distant future, ambitious Caesarism should confront us in earnest, it might be a matter of vital moment whether the traditional policy of the nation's first century had been confirmed or reversed.

EDMUND FISH.

O. H. BROWNING, QUINCY, ILL.

QUINCY, ILL., April 26, 1880.

DEAR SIR—Although having no party affiliations, I am not indifferent to the course of political events, and never fail to exercise the high privilege and to discharge the imperative duty of voting, not for partisans, but for those I may believe the most worthy and best fitted for the duties of the positions to which they may be elevated.

Now, if the Republicans shall nominate Gen. Grant and the Democrats Mr. Tilden I cannot conscientiously support either of them, and there are many others in the same dilemma with myself.

What I wish to know, therefore, is, whether in the contingency above supposed, it is the purpose of the St. Louis Convention to furnish a candidate who can be heartily supported by those who are more anxious to promote the interests of the country, than to uphold an administration in the interest merely of party spoilsmen and rings.

Yours truly, O. H. BROWNING.

Hon. JNO. B. HENDERSON, St. Louis, Mo.

HON. JOHN BRINDLEY, WISCONSIN.

BOSCOBEL, Wis. April 29, 1880.

The resolutions received express my sentiments exactly, and nearly all the Republicans in this part of our state would gladly say the same to you. * * *

Yours truly, JOHN BRINDLEY,
Member Wisconsin State Legislature.

UNALTERABLY FIXED

CROMWELL, Conn., April 29, 1880.

F. T. LEDERGERBER, Esq., St. Louis:

DEAR SIR—Your note of invitation to the St. Louis conference next month is at hand.

It would give me great pleasure to be present and to give my voice, vote and influence against the third-term project.

I am unalterably fixed in my opposition. I shall under no circumstances vote for Grant. My opposition is not so much due to the fact that it would be his third term, as to my conviction of his unfitness for the office. His election means a return to the corrupt practices of his last administration. It means a control of the Government patronage by a senatorial ring composed of Cameron, Carpenter, Conkling, Logan, etc. It means a "kitchen" and "horse jockey" cabinet. It means a reaction from the clean, upright administration of Hayes.

Wishing your movement success, I am sincerely yours.

M. S. DUDLEY.

FROM GRANT'S NATIVE COUNTY.

BETHEL, O., April 19, 1880.

Anti-Third-Term League, St. Louis:

GENTS—In response to your call let me say to you that this (Clermont) is Grant's native county, and that this village was for many years the home of the Grant family, and the General has many relatives now living here. We regard Gen. Grant as Clermont's most distinguished son. We are very proud of him. We say he is the greatest man of the age. We think Grant too wise to accept a nomination at Chicago for a third term, when defeat is certain. This "boom" may prove to be a boomerang and return to injure the boomers. I will say that if you should take the Republicans of this county you would not find five per cent. of the party favorable to a third-term candidate. I don't think that there is more than five per cent. of the Democrats in this county who would favor the nomination of Mr. Tilden. The partisan mills are grinding away for Grant and Tilden, and things look ominous to us, the common citizens, for the nomination of Gen. Grant at Chicago and Samuel Tilden at Cincinnati. I should like to come to your convention, but business will most likely keep me away.

I have been a Republican since the organization of the party, and I do not wish to see the party have a Waterloo defeat, such as we surely will have if we undertake to carry this third-term nonsense.

We have thousands of good men for the office, and should not be compelled to vote for Gen. Grant because the political bummers force the measure. I hope wise counsels will prevail, etc.

Yours truly,

J. M. GOODWIN.

THE EFFECTS APPARENT.

BOSTON, April 17, 1880.

F. T. LEDERGERBER, Esq.:

MY DEAR SIR—The published call which accompanies your invitation is in accordance with the views of three-fourths, at least, of the Republicans in Massachusetts. Those who head the Grant movement here have lost the respect and confidence of the people. Most of them have held office under Grant, and every one of them expects to gain some personal advantage by Grant's re-election. Already the good effects of your protest against the movement are beginning to be seen in the passage of condemnatory resolutions in the local caucuses all over the country. If the delegates to Chicago were not to be elected until September, I doubt if Grant would get a single one of the leading Republican states. Very truly yours,

JAS. M. BUGBEE.

ON WHAT SUCCESS DEPENDS.

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., April 23, 1880.

FRED. T. LEDERGERBER, Secretary:

DEAR SIR—I am heartily in sympathy with the object of the convention. I trust that the deliberations of the convention will result in resolutions of no uncertain sound, and in action that shall prevent the nomination of Gen. Grant at Chicago, by proving that his nomination would be likely to lead to the defeat of the Republican party in November.

The very large body of Republicans who are opposed to Gen. Grant's nomination upon principles which will not allow them to vote for him if nominated, cannot be safely counted out of the party. * * *

The Independents will hold the balance of power, and the success of the Republican party in November is dependent on the selection of a candidate at Chicago for whom they will be ready to labor and to vote.

Trusting that the best results may follow from the action of your convention,

I am with high respect, very truly yours,

CHARLES ELIOT NORTON.

WILMINGTON, Del., May 6, 1880.

To Chairman National Republican Convention, St. Louis:

Patriotic devotion to great principles disregarding ephemeral issues will, I believe, command approval of twenty thousand New York Republicans.

HENRY RANDALL WAITE.

A NEW ISSUE.

BURLINGTON, Iowa, April 26, 1880.

Mr. F. T. LEDERGERBER, Secretary Committee of Convention, St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—The putting forward as a candidate for President of the United States of one who has filled that office for two terms creates a new issue, and must embarrass and weaken, and perchance utterly disintegrate, the Republican party organization. Does it mark a political degeneracy in the Republican ranks?

I trust your efforts, and those of other citizens, to resist it will be vigorous, determined and successful. Should the convention at Chicago be betrayed into such a step, it must lead to new political combinations that will be directed, I think, by wisdom, ability and virtue that will provide new guards for our future security and respect the old landmarks of American society. Your obedient servant,

WM. SLATER.

COL. SAMUEL M. QUINCY, BOSTON.

16 COURT STREET,
BOSTON, April 28, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq., Chairman Anti-Third-Term Committee:

DEAR SIR—I share to the fullest extent the convictions and sympathize in the purposes, as I understand them, of those by whom the convention has been called.

Six years of army service, embracing the whole of the late war, have left in my mind the profoundest admiration for Gen. Grant as a military leader, and were I called on once more to follow the drum in my country's cause there is certainly no living captain upon the planet to whom I should look up with more absolute confidence. Moreover, none will admit more willingly than I that by the Republican dignity, simplicity and modesty of his demeanor, under a shower of European honors, our ex-president has added new lustre to the character of the American citizen. For all that, I should regard his nomination for a third term by the Chicago convention, as one of the most fatal steps which could be taken, whether viewed from the narrow stand-point of party success or in the broad and paramount interests of our country and form of government.

It is the fact—lamentable enough; but it is the fact that to the corrupt methods and practices, to the peculiarly objectionable regime generally of a knot of politicians surrounding and in power under our last president, there has been applied the name of "Grantism." And this label will not wash off, however we may scrub. It may well be that the great man ought not to be held accountable for a tithe even of the evil which has been thus unfortunately stamped with his image and superscription, but the fact remains that it is so stamped—a fact which must throw the party who shall select this candidate into the weakest possible attitude in which to open a campaign—that of exculpation and defence.

The senseless cry for a "strong man," i.e., a candidate who, if elected, may be relied on to assume the reins of government, peaceably if he can, but forcibly if he must, strikes me as the most utter piece of self-stultification ever indulged in by pretended believers in our people's capacity for self-government. It is not so very long since a knot of conspirators surrounding the president of a European republic thus decided upon the necessity of a strong man to save the nation—and the next day the Paris boulevards ran blood, and the adventurer waded through slaughter to a throne. Now, although we know Gen. Grant to be just as incapable of attempting to play such a role as was George Washington, yet such is the logical denouement at which we shall sooner or later arrive, if we now begin by admitting that we must elect a fighter in order to inaugurate him.

And whenever this despairing cry for a strong man shall have echoed across the Atlantic what music will it not be to the ears of those who, at the breaking out of the rebellion, made such exultant haste to announce that "the bubble of the great republic has burst." The long predicted, hoped and prayed for collapse of that people's government whose success shakes every throne will be hailed as imminent. In the name of whatever republican manliness we ought to have inherited from our ancestors, let us not give this aid and comfort to our enemies. Rather let us show the world our firm conviction and our perfect confidence that the government established by our fathers—the government of the people, by the people and for the people, may yet be trusted to stand alone without the assistance of third terms, "strong men," standing armies or bayonets.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

SAMUEL M. QUINCY,
Late Colonel U. S. Colored Troops and B. B. G. Vols.

FROM MAJOR GEORGE B. HALSTED, OF MINNESOTA.

EXCELSIOR, MINN., April 23, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, ESQ.:

You are at liberty to use my name in any way you may think advisable or beneficial for the patriotic object you have in view—defeating the third-terminer, Grant.

I was in Minneapolis and St. Paul recently, and was much gratified at finding many Republicans in sympathy with your movements. The claim is made often that Grant has all his old soldiers with him. This is not true in fact. I want to be present at our county convention, which may prevent my being at St. Louis.

If I am not on hand I shall be glad to be represented by any gentleman agreeing with us, whom you may select.

Respectfully,

GEORGE B. HALSTED.

OWENSBURG, Ky., April 22, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, ESQ., Secretary N. R. Anti-Third-Term, etc., St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR:—Permit me to say that I am most heartily in accord with the objects of your association, and have done, and shall continue to do, all in my power to prevent the nomination of any man for a third time for the Presidency of the United States. The opposition to the Third-Term movement in this State, although not so strong nor so well organized as it might have been, was not altogether in vain. * * * The feeling here against a third term is very strong, and, in case of Grant's nomination, will tend to paralyze the Republican party in Kentucky. I can not tell how many will attend your Convention from this State, but trust that it will be well represented. Trusting that the country will be spared another term of fraud and favoritism, as was Grant's second term, I am,

Most truly yours,

J. W. FEIGHAN.

FROM ETHAN ALLEN.

NEW YORK, April 30.

HON. J. B. HENDERSON:

DEAR SIR—My early departure for Europe will prevent me from attending your convention next week to oppose the wickedness of Grantism. I am with you heart and head, and expect to return from Europe in August to publicly oppose Grant's election if, unfortunately, our party must submit to the curse of his nomination, which God forbid! I strongly urge a resolution, not only against a nomination for a third term, but that we will oppose his election. There can be no principle in the matter short of resisting his election. Let the key-note be opposition to Grant and support of any other man named at Chicago. Believe me,

Yours truly,

ETHAN ALLEN.

NEW YORK, May 3, 1880.

HON. J. B. HENDERSON, Convention of National Republicans:

MY DEAR SIR—I very much regret that I have not been able to join you and our other friends at St. Louis, in their efforts to scotch and kill the political heresy of a third-term, which is the latest treason against our common country. I am very glad in the reflection that I was of those who, eight years ago, under the name of "Liberal Republicans," inaugurated the opposition to that man who, through his friends, and as I believe by his own personal manipulations, now seeks for the third time to be President of the United States; an act which Washington condemned by his example, which Jefferson denounced by special reference, and of which Andrew Jackson would have said "By the Eternal, the man who dares to propose such an insult to me, deserves to be hung as an accursed traitor." Fortunately for the people, the schemes of the conspirators, in this first step towards Empire, are well understood, and can be thwarted by bold and honest opposition. Three men, one in each of the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, placed in power by Grant, through the agency of public patronage, before he retired from the presidency, and undisturbed since in their possessions by Grant's successor, propose to dictate to the Republican party. The issue is thus at once clearly presented and sharply defined. Can such a triumvirate conquer? If so, then the glories of this great Republic have culminated, and the end is not far off. We are fighting desperate men, and if we win at all, it can only be by the boldest methods. We can not afford to speak with bated breath, nor scheme in the dark with any indirection, in the vain hope that the common enemy will be turned from his purpose by the force of moral suasion. If on principle we are honestly opposed to a third term, then we are opposed to the election as well as the nomination. I have

but little faith in those "clubs" and "organizations" that stop at a declaration against a third term. The only opposition that "bites" is that which refuses a vote to Grant even if named at Chicago. I fail to understand the logic of those who say that it is wrong to nominate Grant, and yet that it is right to elect him if nominated. If, on principle, we are opposed to a third term, then it is the election which of necessity we must resist as being the "*substance*" of the controversy. Those so-called "Independent Republicans" are but "sham reformers," who, proclaiming loudly their opposition to Grant, yet lay upon the table all resolutions formulating their professions. As for myself, I never yet have voted a Democratic ticket, nor would I now vote for Tilden, but would rather not vote at all, if he or Grant be the only alternatives; but if Grant be forced upon the Republican party (and failing to nominate a third ticket, for which I should strive), and assuming that the democracy nominate any respectable citizen other than Tilden, I shall deem it to be my duty to prefer country to party, and avoid the greater evil of a third term by openly supporting the Democratic nominee. If your convention will boldly place itself upon this ground, there will be no misunderstanding your position and intentions, after you shall have dispersed to your homes; and such decisive utterance will carry consternation to the camp of the enemy and surely work his defeat.

Apart from the political crime of placing any man for a third time in the Presidential chair, Grant upon his own merits should be cast out, as unworthy of the place. The deficiencies of his former administrations can not be concealed. Have we forgotten that it was under Grant that the "Kuklux" murders were inaugurated in the South? It was under him that the Republicans lost nearly every State in the Union; it was he who left Washington City, with the democracy controlling Congress, for the first time in twenty years; it was under him that we had the "whisky" rings, the "Shepard" rings, and the "Belknap," and "Babcock," and "Robeson" scandals, and other infamies too numerous to mention. Have we forgotten how every association of honorable men throughout the nation felt bound to demand a reform of the abuses of Grant's administration? The "Union League Club" of this city, during the campaign of 1876, declared in a printed report which is now before me, that it favored (as a successor to Gen. Grant), "For a presidential candidate, one who has no connection, direct or indirect, with the errors and abuses which have brought reproach upon the country and the dominant party." One could quote volumes such as this from every State, and of this date. Have we forgotten that Grant's administration was so full of blackness, that it served as a background, to show forth a presidential candidate, whose chief merit was that he had boldly fought its accumulated iniquities? Mr. Benjamin H. Bristow was brought up almost to the presidential line (and would to God that he had crossed it), mainly because he stood out as the most prominent among those who had attempted to repress, redress, and reform the foulness of Grant's last term in office. Now we may well ask, what virtue has so suddenly come into Grant, that he should be returned to resume the work in which he so conspicuously failed, and from which he retired four years ago to the great relief of all patriotic citizens?

There are many giants from whom the Republican party can choose a leader, whose nomination will be of itself the assurance of victory. * * *

I have the honor to remain, yours very truly,

ETHAN ALLEN.

BOSTON, April 11, 1880.

MY DEAR GEN. HENDERSON—I received the copy of the *Republican* containing your anti-third-term speech, every word of which I read, and every word of which I approve. I have been watching your course with great interest, and I write now not only to thank you for your speech, but to wish your convention entire success. * * *

Sincerely and faithfully yours,

J. H. WILSON.

FROM THE STATE TREASURER OF WISCONSIN.

MADISON, WISCONSIN, April 22, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., St. Louis:

DEAR SIR—The Grant movement is daily losing ground in Wisconsin. Even many who heretofore were strongly for Grant, admit now that it would be bad policy for the future success of the Republican party to force Grant on the convention at Chicago. * * * The majority of Wisconsin Republicans are opposed to Grant.

Respectfully Yours,

RICHARD GUENTHER.

FAIRMONT, WEST VIRGINIA, May 3, 1880.

DEAR SIR—I wish I could be with you on the 6th instant at St. Louis, to join my fellow-citizens in their protest against the nomination of a candidate for the third term, for President of the United States, at the approaching election. The call for this anti-third-term convention is opportune and significant. It is not only a protest against Gen. Grant's candidacy, but it is a firm step to strengthen our tenure of liberty and free institutions. He is a deluded citizen who entertains the idea that there are no persons in the United States who long for empire. In 1868 I assisted to elect Gen. Grant President of the United States. I had great doubts of his fitness at the time. The mistake was soon apparent. Rings, nepotism, self-aggrandizement, and intolerance so characterized his first term, that I resolved not to support him for a second. The country saw with shame the ring of Leet & Co. around the bonded warehouses of New York. Contributions were there levied for the benefit of private secretaries of the President, Indian rings, proscription of Sumner and others. I cannot go into detail. These acts are fresh in the minds of the people. Even Gen. Grant was so sensible of his errors, that in his acceptance of the nomination for the second term, he promised to do better. But his second term went from bad to worse, until the country was confronted with the fact that it was being robbed of its revenues by his appointees. Public opinion demanded the prosecution of the offenders. A number of them were convicted in St. Louis, and sent to the penitentiary, but I believe Grant pardoned all of them before his term expired.

Gen. Grant's lust for lucre, as seen by accepting all the gifts presented to him, and bestowing his highest appointments on the men who gave to him most liberally, had more to do with corrupting officials than any thing that has ever occurred in this country. From the watchman to the secretary, they reasoned: "If the President, who has a princely salary, can receive presents and bestow high appointments, why may I not take gain from whomsoever I can obtain it?" Thus, by example, moral restraint was broken down. In fact, his second term so far surpassed the first in offensive acts and reckless disregard of public sentiment, that when the people saw that he was using all of his vast patronage to force his election for a third term, the great Republican party discussed the propriety of a third term as a principle. The opinion of the fathers, as found in the debates in the United States constitutional convention, were laid before the people. The example of patriot presidents, with their reasons therefor, was pointed out. So deep and abiding was the anti-third-term principle impressed upon the minds of the people, that public sentiment demanded that the Congress of the United States should, and it did, in 1875 pass a resolution, with singular unanimity, declaring against a President being a candidate for a third term. Republican conventions in a number of the Republican States, knowing the sentiments of the people, passed similar resolutions, all concurring in the fact that the anti-third-term principle is a part of the unwritten law of the land, is one of the safeguards of liberty, and is as binding as the constitution itself.

In 1875, this third-term principle was better understood by the people than ever before. It is only emergencies which bring up great subjects for discussion in this country. Grant's administrations, with his desire for a third term, brought on *this* discussion; but the reasoning soon passed from the individual to the great principle. The press, orators, statesmen, and essayists threw such a flood of light upon the subject, that the candidacy of a man for the third term, for the presidency, was condemned not for 1876 alone, but for all time to come. But now, in four short years, the great Republican party is insulted by the declaration in effect, that this great discussion was only a political trick; that the Congress, and the Republican Conventions that passed these resolutions, only intended to deceive or amuse the people for a season—that they meant nothing!

At the end of Gen. Grant's second term, he had his trainers, as well as his retainers, who had fattened on his bounty. They had carefully read the history of Cæsar; how he had procured his first and second pro-consulship; how he had amused and built up his popularity among the populace of Rome, by his frequent dispatches, detailing his victories over the semi-savages in Gaul and Britain, and how he had prepared the people of Rome to receive him as a god. All knew the sequel. * * * From Gen. Grant, as a soldier and citizen, I do not desire to take one laurel that he justly deserves; I am discussing him as a third-term candidate, and unfit to be President of the United States. If the people composing the great Republican party are so blind as to foster military heroes for their chief magistrate; if they have so little appreciation of the teachings of history, as not to understand the dangers to the republic of a third term; if they have no more convictions than to place themselves in the hands of selfish politicians, regardless of their better judgment, they are not fit custodians of the precious liberties of the American people, and the sooner the country understands this the better.

But I have an abiding faith in the patriotism of the great body of the Republican party. As a party, I think its principles, aims, and aspirations are far above any other party in the

United States. My brightest hopes for the future of my country, cluster around the prospect of its success. President Hayes, though environed by troubles, brought about by Grant's blunders, by a Democratic House all the time, and a Senate against him, part of the time, has yet made a creditable administration, one that history will honor.

I hope to see a statesman nominated at Chicago, and if such is the case, he will surely be elected. It will be utterly out of the question to elect Gen. Grant, if he is nominated. I believe that if he is the nominee, tens of thousands of Republicans will refuse to go to the polls, rather than stultify themselves by voting for him; and why should they not?

I am looking for good results from your anti-third-term convention. I hope it will adopt wise measures and speak in language not to be misunderstood. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," is a truism; and is as true to-day as at any time in the ages when tyrants made slaves of the people.

Except in Republican France, Cæsarism is lightening its grasp all over Europe, England not excepted. Keep the watch fires of liberty brightly burning!

I am, truly yours,

F. H. PIERPONT.

FROM THE CHAIRMAN REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE.

LANCASTER, KY., April 21, 1880.

DEAR SIR—I am opposed to the nomination of Gen. Grant, and bitterly opposed to the third-term principle; or I might more properly say, want of principle. It would be unnecessary here to give the reasons for the faith within me. * * * Hoping that your convention may do something which will prevent the nomination of Gen. Grant, and save the party from disgrace and defeat, I am,

Very respectfully,

GEO. DENNY, Jr.

FROM GEN. A. C. McCLURG, ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF ONE OF SHERMAN'S ARMY CORPS IN THE MARCH TO THE SEA.

CHICAGO, May 3, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK:

MY DEAR SIR—If you can prevent the nomination of Grant, * * * I shall be heartily rejoiced; and I know of scores of other good men of this ilk possessed of the same feelings. Don't hesitate to go to any length, and I think you will be well backed.

Faithfully yours,

A. C. McCLURG.

FREDERICKTOWN, Mo., April 23, 1880.

COL. EMORY S. FOSTER.

MY DEAR FOSTER—I shall go up to the Convention. I *enthusiastically* endorse what you and all our friends have done to sound the alarm against the third term, and to prepare the country for its defeat, either in or after the Chicago Convention. We can not, and must not stultify ourselves by voting in favor of such a solecism as is this third term, and especially to place Grant back to repeat the follies and crimes of his last administration. *You may relyantly expect me to do all in my power to make the Convention successful. Put me where I will do the most good.*

Sincerely Yours,

B. B. CAHOON.

DETROIT, MICH., April 12, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—I have read with much interest and pleasure of the movement against a third term, and write this for the purpose of offering my services in the cause; as yet no action has been taken here to any purpose. Michigan is most decidedly *anti-Grant*. There are 2,000 good strong Republicans in this city who *will never* vote for Grant, and many thousands more who would personally prefer defeat to the party than have Grant President.

Any suggestions you may make will be gladly received, and I trust the convention, May 6th, may have a good delegation from this State. The enclosed expresses my views of Grant.

Very truly,

JOHN B. CORLISS.

Mt. MORRIS, ILLS., April 15, 1880.

GEN. HENDERSON:

DEAR SIR—I take the liberty to write you this letter, that you may know the feeling in this section in regard to the presidential question. There is a deep-seated hostility here among

a large number of good Republicans about a third term. I find numbers of men here who say they will not vote for Grant again. I know these persons to be in earnest, and I feel myself, that to elect him once more would bode no good to him, to the party, nor to the best interests of the country. I would suggest to you, that you be not timid or wavering in your action at St. Louis. Let the Grant office-brokers understand that you mean business. They will scout at you, but if they find we are in earnest, they will heed your remonstrance. A few documents, such as your own speech, Weed's and Wolsey's letters, are opening the eyes of people.

Excuse me for this brief letter, but I am in earnest.

Very respectfully,

J. HIESTAND.

AUBURN, N. Y., April 10, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary, etc.:

DEAR SIR—All the Republicans in this county except the machine men,—and their number is not large,—are opposed to a third term. I suggest the following names: * * * Mr. Knapp is one of the proprietors of *The Auburn Daily Advertiser*, published here, and which is anti-third-term.

Yours truly,

F. D. WRIGHT.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., April 15, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Secretary, etc.:

DEAR SIR—The feeling in this State I judge to be strong anti-third-term, and in Excelsior, where the matter has been talked up considerably, I have heard of but three (3) persons express for Grant.

With me, although I am firm and sincere in my republicanism, I am free to confess I should cast no vote for U. S. Grant.

Very respectfully,

FRANK H. SHEPARD,
(Late 1st Lt. 24th Mass. Vols), Excelsior Minn.

LOUISVILLE, KY., May 3, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—I am heart and soul with you in the cause. I suppose that Kentucky will lend her aid in the movement, and prove to the world that we are not all for a third term. True, our County Convention and State Convention were manipulated by wire workers in the interest of machine men, but our delegation, I am happy to say, will not be so solid as it has been represented to be. In future, if you will send to Z. O. King, on the *Evening Post*, a strong "anti" man, any documents, he will notice them and be able to give you valuable information. Wishing you a harmonious and fruitful meeting, I am

Respectfully,

C. P. WILL.

MACON, Mo., April 24, 1880.

HON. JOHN B. HENDERSON, St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—The people of the United States have thus far, in their career as a nation, been honorably and patriotically equal to every emergency, and I have implicit trust that they will be true to themselves in this one. While Gen. Grant represents the loyal sentiment of the nation, he also represents personalism, low partisanship, and ignoble selfishness, in American politics. In the former character lies his strength among the masses. In the latter, he rallies the corrupt and partisan politicians of high and low degree. In my opinion, the greatest danger now threatening our institutions is the "spoils system of politics," and of this Gen. Grant is the very embodiment. Amid reproach and contumely, it is necessary for those who would see American freedom perpetuated in its purity, to present an unbroken opposition to the *one-man power* which now threatens our country. Better a Democratic triumph, than a triumph of "Grantism."

Respectfully,

WM. P. BEACH.

LANSING, MICH., April 26, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Secretary.

DEAR SIR—Enclosed please find another list of anti-Grant-to-the-backbone Republicans. The *Evening News*, of Detroit, with a daily circulation of 24,500, is strongly anti-Grant, and is doing good service. Very respectfully,

EMIL FECHT.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 17, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq., Chairman:

DEAR SIR:—I have been a Republican ever since I have been a voter, but shall not vote for Gen. Grant if he is nominated. The tendency for the past five years has been away from the principles on which the Government was founded, and I believe it is time for us to call a halt before going any further on the road which we have been travelling. The third-term movement does such violence to the history and traditions of the country, that I would in no case give my vote for a third term, believing that any one who would accept a nomination for a third term deserves to be distrusted, if not feared. I can not conceive of any one who sincerely desires the permanent welfare of the country as accepting a nomination for a third term; and the mere fact that he is willing to do so, is sufficient reason for the conclusion that he is not fit for the place. Yours very truly,

GEORGE A. BUTLER.

CINCINNATI, O., April 21, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—Speaking for myself, I am free to confess my hearty sympathy with the anti-third-term movement. I yield to no one in my admiration of Gen. Grant as a man of unquestioned integrity, and as a military leader whose achievements on the field of battle will forever entitle him to the profound gratitude of every sincere patriot and lover of human liberty. But notwithstanding all this, I find myself constrained to oppose his present candidacy, for the following reasons:—

In the first place, almost every Republican State convention in 1875 clearly and emphatically endorsed that unwritten law which prohibits more than two presidential terms to the same person, and the nomination of Grant at Chicago would put the Republican party in the awkward predicament of justifying a political doctrine in 1880, which they had expressly condemned in 1875.

Secondly. The election of Grant to a third term—could such a thing happen—would be a direct step towards perpetuating the government of this country in the hands of one man. It would unquestionably be viewed by the masses as a movement in the direction of monarchy. Let the barriers which have been raised by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and others be overthrown, and who can foretell the consequences? The history of this nation has prescribed a limitation to the number of presidential terms, and it behooves every lover of democratic government to insist on an adherence to that limitation.

Thirdly. Should Grant be the nominee at Chicago, he will be overwhelmingly defeated. Professional politicians may manipulate the party machinery to further their own selfish and corrupt purposes, by having delegations instructed to vote for Grant; but from careful inquiries among mechanics and artisans, who constitute the bulk of the party, and who take no stock whatever in politics as a profession, I am satisfied that such an earnest and deep-rooted opposition to a third term exists in the minds of the Republican masses—at least in this section of the country—as to make Grant's defeat in Ohio a foregone conclusion.

Several other reasons suggest themselves, but lack of leisure compels me to forbear. The continuance of the Republican party in power is to my mind a thousand fold of greater consequence than the personal aggrandizement of any man, or of any hundred men. The party exists, not for the purpose of elevating any individual to power, but for the advocacy and establishment of certain principles of government, which are deemed essential to the cause of civil liberty and of human progress. Hence the anxiety of the Republican masses to have nominated at Chicago a man who will lead them on to victory beyond a peradventure, and not one whose leadership implies inevitable defeat.

Yours truly,

W. H. JONES.

CINCINNATI, April 26, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., St. Louis:

DEAR SIR—Since my former letter to you, I have become more convinced than ever, that should Grant be the Chicago nominee, the Republican party will be doomed to utter defeat next November. Last Saturday evening, I acted as judge at a primary election held in Precinct A, Third Ward of this city. Scores of business men, who had never before been known to attend a primary election, presented themselves at the poles for the avowed purpose of defeating any effort that might be made to elect Grant delegates to the State Convention, and of the three hundred votes that were cast, a large proportion of those who cast them expressed voluntarily, and without any solicitation whatever, their emphatic determination not to support

Grant in case he is the nominee. *One man only expressed a preference for Grant*, whereas scores spontaneously expressed their uncompromising opposition to him.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. JONES.

EVANSVILLE, IND., April 17, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary, St. Louis:

DEAR SIR—I desire to add my voice to the endorsement of the movement in opposition to Grant.

1. As a true Republican, desiring the success of our party, I do not think he can be elected.
2. After mature reflection, I can not obtain my consent to vote for him.

I am surprised to find the indignant feeling among Republicans against the Grant movement. A gentleman who has just canvassed the State for a candidate for a State office at our coming convention, tells me that nine out of ten of all the Republicans of the State, that he has talked with, are strongly opposed to the movement. He is reliable. Grant, if nominated, will lose Indiana, 50,000 votes. * * *

Yours truly,

J. E. IGLEHART.

DETROIT, March 25, 1880.

HON. JOHN B. HENDERSON, St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—The movement begun in your city in opposition to the third-term scheme, rejoices the hearts of thousands of Republicans in Michigan to-day. We should be glad to see it defeated in convention for the sake of the party; but if not, we will do our patriotic duty at the polls, and bury it so deep that it will never be resurrected. We love the Republican party, but if it must be sacrificed to defeat this diabolical scheme, let it die. Country first, and party afterward, is the motto of Michigan Republicans.

Very truly, yours,

S. N. HURLBUT.

WARRENTON, Mo., April 28, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—As a life-long Republican, I should certainly shrink from doing anything to imperil the success of that party, but I believe I am less of a partisan than a patriot, and the situation is in my estimation sufficiently grave to justify the decision that it is better to abandon the party than the unwritten law, which helps to support our free institutions. Better to let the party perish than help to merge it in Grantism and personal rule. I believe the nomination of the ex-President means the defeat of the Republican party, and I am ready, therefore, to do whatever I can to prevent it. I purpose attending, and hope much may be accomplished.

Respectfully,

HAMILTON MOORE.

OFFICE "DER NEW YORK REPUBLIKANER,"

(The only German Republican paper published in New York City.)

NEW YORK CITY, April 1, 1880.

SENATOR J. B. HENDERSON, St. Louis, Mo.:

SIR—The 75,000 German-Americans of New York State are "solid" against the third term. Without them the "syndicate" has no chance to carry this State, except by legislative proxy, which is evidently the last ditch in this desperate game of theirs.

I hope that the third term will not be saddled on the party. It is too heavy a load, and ninety per cent. of the 700,000 German voters in the Union will not swallow the "hemlock" cup.

Grant can not carry this State on that account; but we apprehend that the electoral votes of New York State will, in event of his nomination, be delivered by legislative proxy, which the third-term syndicate is quite desperate enough to attempt.

Der New York *Republikaner* represents truly the prevailing sentiment (in this great State) among our Germans. * * *

You ought to see to it that Illinois does not kiss the third-term toe in her convention — then the bottom will be knocked out — otherwise it is my prediction that the senatorial syndicate will appear at Chicago, with the electoral vote of New York on a *presentation plate* for the third term, or its *substitute*, viz.: No one than "Roscoe Conkling" himself. You may depend upon it, that is "the flattering unction which they lay to their souls."

I suppose that you are aware that I drafted the call which was issued February 9, 1880, by the German-American Republicans of New York State, protesting against a third-term, and which was the first and initiatory step in this State against the third-term syndicate. Since then numerous other steps have been taken, all towards the same purpose.

Truly yours,
(Editor of the New York *Republikaner*, 234 and 235 Broadway.)

J. C. F. BYLAND,

CHICAGO, ILL., April 16, 1880.

DEAR SIR:—Why don't you prepare pledges for circulation, which shall bind Republicans to oppose Grant if he be nominated?

I propose to attend the convention; meanwhile, you can command me in furtherance of the ends which it will seek to attain.

Yours truly,

HENRY L. SHEPARD, Editor *Alliance*.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., April 16, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—I sympathize heartily with the purpose of the convention.

I attended yesterday, as a delegate, our Republican State Convention. The sentiment which united a two-thirds majority of the convention was opposition to Grant. * * * There have been few organizers or workers. The convention—a very strong, intelligent body—expressed the spontaneous sentiment of the people, the sober and serious convictions of Massachusetts Republicanism. * * *

May I suggest to you some points from the Massachusetts standpoint:—

1. Our people's objection to Grant, while it rests partly on the adherence to the no-third-term tradition, consists chiefly, I think, in dislike of his presidential record, his character, and his associates.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE F. MERRIAM.

FROM THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., April 27, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR—I intend to be in St. Louis on May 6th. I am in full sympathy with your movement, and will do any thing in my power to add to its success. Yours truly,

GABRIEL C. WHARTON.

To Hon. JOHN B. HENDERSON, St. Louis, Mo.

GRAND ISLAND, N. C., May 3, 1880.

To F. T. LEDERGERBER, Secretary:

DEAR SIR—Your communication is duly received, and we heartily sympathize with the resolutions of the anti-third-term movement. In our State of Nebraska a Grant boom of any extent never has prevailed, and whatever existed has nearly expired since the wire-workers of the Grant-machine, so shameful to the Republican party, packed the State conventions in Pennsylvania, Missouri, and everywhere they could get a hold. Here in central Nebraska more than seven-eighths of the Republicans are opposed to a third-term candidate, especially our German population.

We sincerely hope that the convention of the better elements of the Republican party will be instrumental, that at the National Convention in Chicago a candidate may be nominated whom the German Republican voters can heartily support to the end of a successful election as President.

We oppose strongly the idea of having a sovereign again. We made this country our home, where we abjured all allegiance and fidelity to princes, whosoever they are; and we do not wish to be subjects again of a potentate in this country. This is the general sentiment among our German population here.

Very respectfully we remain,

KARL GUSE,
WILLIAM STOLLEY,

WORCESTER, MASS., April 19, 1880.

Mr. F. T. LEDERGERBER.

DEAR SIR—I believe the hour calls for plain outspoken words in regard to our duty at the present time. You have doubtless seen by the newspapers that Massachusetts has declared against a third term. * * * I look upon the Republican party as one destined in the future to work out a more glorious achievement than it has yet accomplished. Let us remember our standard bearer should be a man that we can trust and all follow without one deserter. Mutiny at the present means defeat. We must have a united party, a solid phalanx. With this we shall be victorious; without it, I fear defeat. Yours truly,

E. H. HILL.

HUNTINGTON, SUFFOLK COUNTY, N. Y., April 17, 1880.

* * * I don't know a man in this place who declares his preference for Grant. If Chicago won't give us something better than Grant, get Cincinnati to give us, etc. Faithfully, JAMES T. MCKAY.

From the Editor of the Indianapolis *News*.

INDIANAPOLIS, April 26, 1880.

DEAR SIR—I have your invitation to attend the Anti-Third-Term Convention next week, and will not only try to be there, but shall endeavor to induce attendance from this State.

FRED. L. LUDERGERBER, Esq., St. Louis.

Yours truly,

J. H. HOLLIDAY.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR—Deeply interested in the matter myself, I have been at considerable pains during the last month to quietly sound my friends and the many gentlemen I come in contact with, who are with me Republican in politics. The deep-seated, though undemonstrated feeling against the third term has astonished and filled me with satisfaction. Often where I expected a doubtful or qualified opposition, I was delighted to find an intense determination against the ambition of the "Great Sacrificer." The sentiment of the people is right; they lack only organization.

I am very truly yours,

JAS. G. JONES.

FROM THE EDITOR OF "THE PUBLISHERS' WEEKLY."

NEW YORK, May 4, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR—I believe there is less danger to the Republican party in temporary defeat than in the election of General Grant for a third term, and conscientious Republicans will fail of their duty if they do not make determined opposition—first, to his nomination; if necessary to his election. The Republican party, the Republican managers, force on us a bad candidate. I hope to see him defeated. We shall at least, as good Republicans, succeed, I think, in restoring the Republican majority in the House which General Grant lost to us in his *second* term; and in that event, a good Democratic President would be less objectionable than a bad Republican one.

Truly yours,

R. R. BOWKER.

To the Secretary Invitation Committee, St. Louis Convention.

COVINGTON, Ky., April 16, 1880.

EMERY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary, St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—I am heartily in sympathy with the movement, and am satisfied that a very large majority of the white voters in this State are opposed to a third term for General Grant. They believe his nomination would be unwise and dangerous. The party is almost absolutely certain of defeat, with him as its candidate.

Very truly yours,

D. N. COMINGORE.

MADISON, IND., April 23, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—As to the "third-term" sentiment, I can say, that so far as this city and county are concerned, there is very little of it!—perhaps not twenty Grant men in the county; no third-term for us! * * * * *

Yours respectfully,

G. W. SOUTHWICK.

33 EAST 83D STREET, May 3, 1880.

Messrs. HITCHCOCK, PRETORIUS, FINKELBURG, etc.:

DEAR SIR—I have received your invitation to attend the "National Anti-third-term Republican convention," in St. Louis, on May 6th, and beg to thank you for the honor. Were it feasible for me, I should try to be present, and at least add one to the numbers which I trust may emphasize the protest against the renomination of Gen. Grant.

It is a constant surprise to me that intelligent men fail to realize the gravity of the situation, when a Republic proposes to break through the only barrier against prolonged personal power in the Executive. That apathy is itself the sign that the Republic is slowly making ready for the repeated experience of history. Those whose eyes are open should "cry aloud," and, if you will allow in a clergyman, another Biblical phrase, "the trumpet must give no uncertain sound." Let it sound through the country the determination of hosts of good Republicans, who have voted no other ticket for years, to *refuse their suffrage* to the ambition that would ask that which our greatest and best have declined to solicit.

Let it say out frankly that hosts of Republicans will never vote to bring back the regime that shamed the nation, palsied the party, and demoralized the young of the whole land. Let it say plainly that the minority which holds the balance of power, does not only protest beforehand against this fatal nomination, but is resolved to bolt it if made! What that means we have taught our masters in this State.

Wishing you all success,

I am, yours truly,

R. HEBER NEWTON.

GREENFIELDS MASS., April 19, 1880.

DEAR SIR — The nomination of Gen. Grant, followed by mere action on the part of the Democrats, would, in my judgment, render Massachusetts a doubtful State.

Truly Yours,

EDWARD E. LYMAN.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq., Chairman, etc.

NEW YORK, April 23, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER:

DEAR SIR — It is my good fortune to come in contact with quite a large number of American and German Republican voters. I find that the Germans are all agreed that a re-election for a third term is a dangerous procedure, and has a tendency to establishing a bad precedent, and looks too much to personal government. They are consequently opposed to a third term. I am very sincerely yours,

J. SHERMAN.

FROM EX-U. S. SENATOR FOWLER, OF TENNESSEE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 29, 1880.

HON. JOHN B. HENDERSON: —

DEAR SIR: — I congratulate you on your noble speech, and the decided position assumed by Missouri Republicans against the ruinous party madness manifested by that great party which has made so many sacrifices for the republic. Weary of patriotic effort, the leaders have surrendered the interests of the country to the hope of retaining power. Grant loves small men and those whose ambitions and desires subordinate to the means of gratification. He has and will prostitute the patronage of the republic to the basest purposes. His disqualifications spring as much from his innate affections as from the influence of surrounding circumstances.

The third-term principle is dangerous, and threatens the ultimate ruin of republican principles in the country. It is the breaking down of those moral restraints imposed by experience and conviction on the exercise of party ambition and personal interests. These moral bonds have alone preserved our liberties and institutions from ruin.

I am not now about to discuss the questions you have treated so ably. I can support no man for a third term, and Grant has no claims upon the American people that entitle him to such an honor or dishonor, for certainly it is a disgrace to countenance so destructive a passion for power.

I hope the protest you are making may be sufficient to warn the American people of their danger. If I can do so, I will be with you. The Republican party has men enough of ability for President without resorting to so gross a disregard of our dearest interests. So far from wanting a strong man, if Grant were that, the country had better dispense with the office entirely.

I hope for your movement the greatest success.

Yours truly,

Jos. S. FOWLER.

CALEDONIA, LIVINGSTON Co., N. Y., April 20, 1880.

E. S. FOSTER, St. Louis, Mo.:

SIR — Grant will cost the party 4 per cent. of the vote here—and I think more if we can have an opposition candidate who is a good Republican.

Grant under no circumstances, and another candidate if Grant is nominated at Chicago, is what we want. Respectfully,

W. W. LEWIS.

NEW YORK, April 15th, 1880.

EMERY FOSTER, Esq.:

SIR — When we started this anti-third-term movement we had no idea that we would meet with the success we have. Myself with five friends started at my residence, held a meeting, passed resolutions, and appointed officers, and in the course of ten days found it would not answer the requirements of the call to hold meetings at a private residence. We now hold our

meetings on Avenue C, and things are progressing finely among the workingmen of this district. The only time I have to work in the cause is evenings, being employed in business which takes all the hours of the day. We have several good men in this district who would be pleased to attend the convention. Time and money are wanting, more especially the money, I expect, as they are all mechanics, but well posted in politics. It would be impossible for me to attend, as I have not the time to spare. The feeling here is very strong against a third term, and the work goes bravely on. Hoping we shall meet with success, I remain yours truly,

JOSEPH L. BAILEY.

BOSTON, April 17, 1880.

HON. HENRY HITCHCOCK, Chairman:

* * * * * We have already done some work in Massachusetts, and we shall continue to exert what influence we may have in the same direction.

Our convention at Worcester, last Thursday, spoke in the most emphatic way against Grant, and it is evident that we should lose many thousand votes in Massachusetts if he is nominated.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE G. CROCKER.

FROM THE EDITOR OF "THE BRISTOL BANNER."

BRISTOL, IND., April 7, 1880.

TO THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN ANTI-THIRD-TERM CONVENTION, St. Louis, Mo.:

GENTLEMEN — Now my *candid* opinion is that nine out of every ten Republicans in this Elkhart County are strongly in opposition to Grant, only as a third-term candidate. Again, it is my honest opinion that two out of every five Republicans of this Elkhart County will vote the Democratic ticket, if Grant is made the nominee.

Respectfully,

C. F. MOSIER.

FROM THE MAYOR OF NEW LISBON.

NEW LISBON, OHIO, April 8, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, St. Louis, Mo.:

KIND SIR — Yours of 3d inst., with enclosure, received to-day. In reply, I am an anti-third termer of the stalwart kind; should estimate (based on hearing parties speak of the matter, and reliable reports) that about one hundred out of voting Republican men in this (centre) township of about six hundred, would not vote for Grant, if nominated; and I think that a fair part of the entire party in at least the ratio of one hundred out of every six hundred Republican voters in this county would not vote for Grant, if nominated; and the same proportion of the counties north of this county would do the same thing. Of one thing be assured, that if driven to the nomination of Grant, very many of us could not vote next fall, or else vote for an independent anti-third termer, and thus teach such leaders as Cameron and Conkling a lesson, notwithstanding the above treasonable (?) utterances to party fealty. I have in the past always been a stalwart Republican, and no one can prevent me from being a Republican in the future; but Republicanism ends with two terms to one man as President of the United States. If any further service can be rendered in any way, advise me.

I am respectfully,

J. M. DICKINSON.

MIAMISBURG, OHIO, March 27, 1880.

CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN AND THIRD-TERM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

SIR — We, as privates in the army of politicians, do not get that fair representation with which we are justly entitled. Stalwarts map out a line of campaign suited to their views and interests, entirely ignoring the element that accomplishes the work, viz., the rank and file. When do you see the views of a man in comparative obscurity published in the newspapers of the land; on the contrary, men of prominence and political tricksters' views are eagerly sought after for publication; thus the sentiment of a very small minority is substituted for the great mass — the power behind the throne — and there is where the Republican party is going to wake up to a realization of its mistakes, if these men of prominence in politics persist in forcing Gen. Grant on the people as a presidential candidate. Here in my own locality, men who are stanch Republicans, and who have always voted the Republican ticket, will hesitate, and many refuse to sacrifice this inborn principle of the nation within them, to slaughter their best convictions by voting for Gen. Grant. The earnest prayer of enlightened Democracy is for Grant's nomination; they plainly see victory for their party in this State if he is nominated. Again the Government, since its organization on this principle of unwritten law, has been steadily advanc-

ing, and is now the peer of any nation on earth; and when they come to try to subvert the will of the people, backed up by history of the past, in forcing upon them an untried, hazardous, and doubtful experiment, they are going far in the direction of a defeat to the Republican party. It has been advocated by men of great height in politics, that when you get a good man for president, keep him there as long as he behaves well, even for life, and then we will be saved this strife and agitation, consequent on these frequent changes in office.

Agitation has been the life and promoter of the grand institutions that our country is blessed with, and whenever we settle down to a comatose state under one-man-power, believing we have the right man in the right place, in all likelihood we will be waked up to a stern reality that we have surrendered the fundamental principles of our Government, obtained in an eight long years of struggle by our forefathers. If all the opposition in private could be arrayed publicly, it would necessitate the immediate withdrawal of Gen. Grant, as a candidate; it is in justice to Gen. Grant that it should be, and not be made the victim of representations made to him by his powerful political friends, who are trying to smother this opposition to a third-term.

JOHN H. COONS.

QUINCY, ILL., April 29, 1880.

GENTLEMEN — Those who desire to reverse the precedents set by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson, and elect a citizen for a third term, must show either that a great crisis is at hand, which demands exceptional measures, or that their candidate has such peculiar qualifications for the office, that precedents, even when set by such men, should be reversed for him. It seems to me that their persistent attempts to prove both these propositions are marked failures. There is no crisis; and their eulogies of the ex-President, begin and end in assurances that he would not, if elected, repeat the disastrous policy which caused general satisfaction with the conclusion of his eight years' reign.

I use the word "reign" advisedly; for many prominent supporters of the third term avow that they advocate Gen. Grant's renomination in the confident hope that, if elected, as no President ever has been, he will take this high position, and use it in a manner no President was ever intended to. I am, gentlemen, with very sincere respect,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM EVERETT.

PADUCAH, KY., May 3, 1880.

HON. EMORY FOSTER, Secretary, etc., St. Louis, Mo.:

MY DEAR SIR — I am in sympathy with the purposes of your Convention, and am fully aware of its importance. Tell Hubbard that whatevr he may assume for Kentucky, he may calculate on my cordial coöperation. I am with the Convention, even though its resolutions extend to the nomination of an anti-third-term candidate, if Grant is nominated at Chicago. And, although I have been appointed elector for this district by the Republican State Conveution which recently met at Louisville, I will decline that position, as I have already intimated I would, if Grant is nominated at Chicago, and stump the State on behalf of the anti-third-term candidate. Yours truly,

E. W. BAGBY.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., May 2, 1880.

EMORY S. FOSTER, Esq., Secretary of Anti-Third-Term Republican Executive Committee, St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR — The Republicans of this city opposed to the renomination of General Grant, formed an Anti-Grant Club last night, and elected the following officers: President, Col. R. H. Hunt; Secretary, Henry Stubenrauch. The following gentlemen were chosen as delegates to the Anti-Third-Term Convention to be held in your city May 6th: * * * *

Yours truly,

HENRY STUBENBAUCH,
Secretary of Club.

F. W. HAYES, DETROIT.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN, April 15, 1880.

F. T. LEDERGERBER, Esq., Secretary:

DEAR SIR — I am in full sympathy with you in your efforts to save the Republican party from the responsibility of nominating any person for a third term, and will gladly render all the assistance I can to make your labors successful. * * *

Very respectfully,

F. W. HAYES.

THE "STRONG MAN" IDEA.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE, WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., April 19.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—* * * Massachusetts has just spoken in a decisive manner against the candidacy of Gen. Grant, and I trust such action will be taken by the Republicans before the convention at Chicago as shall convince the delegates who are to meet there that the country is not ready to depart from the safe custom established by the example of all other former Presidents, excepting the one who now seems anxious for a third term.

I believe a majority of the people would regret to see the administration again conducted as it was under Gen. Grant; that they are opposed to a third term, and to the idea that a President has any power to reach the presidential chair by armed force, by acting the "strong man." They believe he is a private citizen until he is inaugurated by the regularly-constituted servants of the people.

Truly yours,

P. A. CHADBOURNE.

CONGRESSMEN IN DANGER.

MUSCATINE, IA., April 27, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Esq.:

DEAR SIR—* * * * I hope great good will result from the action of the convention. Iowa, as a State, will vote for the Chicago nominee, be it Gen. Grant or any other; but should Gen. Grant be the nominee, I fear we will lose two, if not three, of our Congressmen. If the Democrats make a judicious nomination, I do not believe Gen. Grant can be elected.

Yours truly,

G. B. DENISON,
Chairman Republican County Committee.

CLEAVE TO THE PRINCIPLE.

CATLETTSBURG, KY., April 30, 1880.

HON. HENRY HITCHCOCK:

DEAR SIR—I hope that the moral effect of the convention of the 6th of May will prevent the nomination of Gen. Grant.

I permit no man to go before me in honoring Gen. Grant, but am unwilling to sap the life of the nation to gratify an ambition that should be now satiated. Our debt to him is great, but not so great as to require self-sacrifice. It would have been better to have avoided the sacrifice of 500,000 lives and \$5,000,000,000 of treasure, and had two governments with the Republican principle more or less strong actuating each, than to have saved the nation at such frightful cost to introduce the monarchical principle for the personal benefit of our successful general. I have no personal hostility to Gen. Grant, and if it involved no sacrifice of principle, could cheerfully support him; but I do believe, in common with the masses of the party, in the unwritten law, which has as much force as the English (an unwritten) constitution, and therefore cleave to the principle and reject the man. Those who urge him upon the party against its wish are endangering his glory, and for this reason I cannot believe them to be in the main his friends, but schemers seeking self at the enormous price of another's reputation.

In this emergency we should not consult our personal preferences, but national safety and well-being. The nation outweighs any man's fortunes.

It is now clear that the people do not demand his nomination. Then why force it upon them? The machine, only, has spoken in New York, Pennsylvania and Kentucky. Unless the gods have made them mad, they ought not to attempt to make men vote as they wish, regardless of the voter's will. The "strong-man" argument means nothing or too much. If it mean back-bone, the "Maine steal" showed that Blaine has it; resumption showed that Sherman has it; the Franco-Prussian war showed that Washburne has it; and the reputation of Senator Edmunds in Congress shows his patriotism and courage to be as rock-ribbed and strong as the mountains of his native State. If it mean more than this, the conservative, law-abiding sentiment of the nation will grind the party supporting it into dust; or if our Goliath bring down ruin upon our enemies, the temple of constitutional government will fall also. It is a cruel necessity that will compel us to choose either horn of the dilemma. Grant is the symbol of force, and his nomination is likely to beget opposing force. We should not threaten force, nor should we cower before it. Let us declare for honest money, a free and fair election or a fair fight, and we will surely win; but if we begin with driving away our friends, and embolden our enemies, who have not recovered their courage since the war, by crying "but one man can win," alas! for our hopes. If Gen. Grant should be elected, the indications are that he would

build a personal party; and this means a Grant party ruled by Grant, personal government, centralization. In the face of which the people would for at least a period, until frightened by its excesses, prefer a party with an opposite tendency.

Before we nominate Gen. Grant, we should honestly answer these questions: What strong man gave Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas, to the Democracy? And rent the Republican party? What lost the elections of 1874? What nearly lost the election of 1876? Gen. Grant's nomination involves a defensive campaign, and a disputed election—possibly civil war; and when we fight over a disputed election we are Mexicanized. Any other candidate secures an aggressive campaign and a decisive peaceful victory.

Can we do our enemy a greater service than to give him the first principle (third-term) he has had for a platform for twenty years? Can we better secure our own defeat?

As a Southerner who never cast a vote disloyal to the nation, I am bold to say, that it is not decent for the South, that can give no help in the hour of battle, to force a candidate upon the States that must elect and plan a campaign that they must win.

In 1861 Ohio and Indiana reached out their strong arms and saved Kentucky to the Union, although the effort whitened our fields with the bleaching bones of their sons. As a native Kentuckian, I feel that it was not generous, but ungrateful for Kentucky to forget this sacrifice and dictate the nomination of a candidate distasteful to them. It was not Kentucky that spoke, but the lust of the politician and the craven fear of her most ignorant voters.

Kentucky will endorse the action of her district delegates who refuse to be bound by State instructions.

If your movement fails, I fear the history of the Republican party is ended, and with it the reign of Northern civilization. That will be a dark day. As the alien and sedition laws caused Southern civilization to dominate this land for sixty years, so will the third term stay the hand of progress for years—perhaps forever. It is a red-hot shame that one man's ambition should hang the scale of a conflict between two civilizations.

Respectfully,

R. C. BURNS.

ELKHART, IND., May 1, 1880.

HENRY HITCHCOCK, Chairman, etc.:

DEAR SIR—I am opposed to the nomination of Grant:

First. Because to elect any man to the presidency for a third term is to break down one of the safeguards of the republic.

Second. Because he can not be elected, and his nomination, and certain defeat, would place the rebel Democracy in full possession of every department of the government; and thus Grant would, by his third effort for the presidency, surrender to the rebel generals nearly everything that Lee surrendered to him at Appomattox.

Third. Because he ought not to be elected for the reason that all his patronage is already mortgaged to the men whose questionable conduct, in Grant's previous administration, nearly destroyed the Republican party.

Fourth. He is now a party to the fraudulent transactions that are employed to secure his nomination, and brought to shame and mortification his former supporters, by running from place to place to secure the nomination, like a two-year-old boy crying for a tin whistle.

Grant could not carry either of the following States: New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, California, or Oregon, nor one of the late slave States, and his nomination would make at least four of the other States doubtful. I cannot but hope that your convention will do much to save the Republican party and the nation.

Truly yours,

M. F. SHUEY.

MUSCATINE, IA., April 30, 1880.

FRED. T. LEDERGERBER, Secretary, St. Louis, Mo.:

DEAR SIR—Permit me to express my hearty sympathy with the object of the convention, as set forth in the call for the same. While the objections to a third presidential term are sufficiently great to attract the attention of all thoughtful and patriotic citizens, they should be particularly emphasized in the case of Gen. Grant. The abuses and corruption which characterized his previous administration not only demonstrated his unfitness for the presidency, but alienated a large and influential body of voters from the Republican party, thereby enabling the Democracy to gain control of Congress—an event to be deplored, not only as a disaster to the Republican party, but as a national calamity, and a constant menace to good government.

While the primary object of your convention is to avert the impending danger of the nomination of Gen. Grant at the Chicago convention, it should be your duty as well as your privi-

lege, to denounce, without hesitation and without reserve, the nomination of any candidate who has not a record above the breath of suspicion, and to demand in the name of all Republicans who love good government and their country more than their party, the nomination of some statesman of ability and unquestioned integrity, who can command the support of the large and increasing body of thoughtful and independent voters, whose views have been expressed to some extent by the Independent Republican Committee of New York, the National Republican League of Philadelphia, and the convention of Young Republicans of Massachusetts.

With the hope that your convention will be harmonious, and that its action will be such as to exert a powerful influence upon the Chicago convention, in the interest of a good government, I am very truly yours.

W. A. CLARK.

FROM A WEST VIRGINIA EDITOR.

WHEELING, W. VA., April 24.

DEAR SIR — Your letter of the 22d to hand. I would like to be present at your Anti-Third-Term Convention of May 6, but fear I cannot be. Our paper is strongly committed against Grant's nomination, and we are greatly in hopes he can be defeated at Chicago.

Ex-Gov. F. H. Pierpont, Fairmount, Marion County, W. Va., is one of the most prominent opponents of Grant in this State. No Republican paper in the State supports Grant.

Very truly.

A. W. CAMPBELL,
(Editor *Intelligencer*.)

Hundreds of other letters were received from all parts of the country, containing the same views as are contained in these published.

MORE EXPRESSION OF VIEWS.

On motion of Mr. Fox, Mr. R. A. Hill, of Indiana, was invited to address the convention. Mr. Hill, on taking the platform, delivered an eloquent and earnest address. He said the friends of Gen. Grant came before the people asking them to disregard the precedent established and recognized for generations, in order that he might hold an office. The precedent was not adopted for the first century of the republic, but for all time, as long as the republic should exist. It was adopted as a protection and defence against the danger of a man of uncertain patriotism and undue ambition. This government was established for a permanency. When our fathers chose the emblem of our nationality they rejected the design of a flag with the tree of liberty upon it, beneath the branches of which the oppressed of all nations might find shelter. They said this would not do; the storms of heaven would rend it, the worm would bore it to the heart, and it would die. The next design offered contained a pyramid, the most lasting of architectural structures, but the fathers said, even mountains would wear away; and this was also rejected. Then they chose the red from the rosy dawn, and the field of blue from the expanse of heaven; this they studded with thirteen of the brightest fixed stars of the firmament, and that was the design adopted. Why should the honored precedent of a generation be violated for one man? No one man was a necessity for forty millions of people. It was now well known that the call for Grant was not the spontaneous expression of a people's desire, but was an artificial excitement worked up by designing men. The need for a strong government was a delusion; the government to-day was the strongest on earth. Its strength had been demonstrated in no doubtful way. The proposition to place the power in one man's hands must rest on the claim that the vices were on the part of the governed, and the virtues were with those who govern — a claim which was in direct conflict with the whole theory of American institutions. Mr. Hill's speech was warmly applauded.

THE PLATFORM.

In pursuance of the demand, and representing the convictions of what we believe to be a majority of the Republican party throughout the Union, this convention of Republicans has assembled for the purpose of declaring those convictions, with reference to the present aspect of political affairs. Their deliberate and emphatic expression is especially demanded in view of the determined efforts made to force upon the party the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency for a third term, in defiance not only of the traditions of the government as established by its founders, and consecrated by unbroken and venerable usage and prescription down to the present time, but also of the solemn declarations of the Republican party through its conventions in the largest and controlling Republican States, reaffirmed by its representatives in the popular branch of Congress, and adopted by the entire party in the declaration of its latest Presidential candidate; be it therefore

Resolved, That the members of this convention, for themselves and those whom they represent, hereby reaffirm their devotion to the principles of the Republican party as heretofore set forth by its authorized representatives. And in view of present exigencies, we do especially reaffirm the recent declarations of State Republican conventions, as follows:—

By the convention of New York, 1875: "We declare our unalterable opposition to the selection of any President for a third term."

By the State convention of Pennsylvania, 1875, reaffirmed in 1876: "We are unalterably opposed to the election to the presidency of any person for a third term."

By the State of Ohio: "The observance of Washington's example will be in the future, as it has been in the past, regarded as a fundamental rule in the unwritten law of the Republic."

By the Massachusetts Republican convention, 1875: "Sound reason, as well as the wise and unbroken usage of the Republic, illustrated by the example of Washington, requires that the term of the chief magistrate of the United States should not exceed a second term."

Like sentiments having been announced by the Republican convention of Minnesota and other Republican States, and having been affirmed in 1875 by an overwhelming majority of both political parties in the national House of Representatives in the following words:

"That the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States, in retiring from the Presidential office after their second term, has become by universal concurrence a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

Resolved, That the nomination of a third-term candidate is especially to be deprecated, because it will unavoidably put the Republican party on the defensive; because it will revive the memory of public scandals and official corruption which brought our party to the verge of ruin, and will again alienate a large and powerful body of voters, without whose aid success is neither possible nor deserved; while in the character and surroundings of the third-term candidate we find no sufficient guarantee against their reoccurrence, but rather a renewed menace in the history of the men who are loudest in his support.

Resolved, That we believe that the questions now agitating the public mind, connected as they are with the currency, the tariff, the civil service, the railroads and other means of intercommunication, require the talents of a trained statesman. We find objections to the third-term nomination now urged upon the country also in that it would substitute a dangerous tendency to personal government, for a determined and unwearied effort for this the reform of the civil service; that reform, fearless and thorough, we declare to be vital to the welfare and safety of the republic itself.

Resolved, That as Republicans we cannot be hero worshippers; and we demand from a party without a master, the nomination of a candidate without a stain.

Resolved, That a national committee of 100 be appointed and instructed, in the event of the nomination of General Grant, to meet in the city of New York, at the call of the chairman of this committee, and then to act in such manner as they shall then deem best to carry out the spirit and purpose of these resolutions; the said committee to be selected by a committee of eleven, and published at its earliest convenience.

Mr. G. L. Wright, St. Louis, nominated the following as the committee of eleven to select a national committee of one hundred: Lucien Eaton, Emil Pretorius, and Henry Hitchcock, of Missouri; E. C. Hubbard, of Kentucky; W. S. Allerton, New York; J. W. Carter, Massachusetts; E. R. Wood, Pennsylvania; J. H. Jones, Ohio; W. W. Williams, Minnesota; R. A. Hill, Indiana; Bluford Wilson, Illinois.

On motion of Col. Wilson, of Illinois, the names of Mr. F. W. Whitridge, of New York, and Gen. Henderson, of St. Louis, were added to the committee.

Isador Bush moved the appointment of a committee of five to present the proceedings of the convention to the Chicago Convention. Carried.

The chair named the following gentlemen to act: E. C. Hubbard, of Kentucky; Bluford Wilson, R. A. Hill of Indiana; E. R. Wood, of Pennsylvania, and John M. Carter, of Massachusetts.

Col. Bluford Wilson, of Illinois, offered the following:

Resolved, That the cordial thanks of this convention be, and the same are hereby extended to the various local committees for their efforts, crowned as they have been with such gratifying success, to provide for the comfortable and convenient transaction of the business of this meeting.

Adjourned *sine die*.

Attest: JOHN B. HENDERSON,
Chairman.

EUGENE A. GUILBERT,
Secretary.